BETHEL SEMINARY LIBRARY
REG 220.6 T32M
Terry, Milto Moses and the prophets; an
3 0513 0000 4240 4

MOSES AND THE PROPHETS

AN ESSAY TOWARD A FAIR AND USEFUL STATEMENT OF SOME OF THE POSITIONS OF MODERN BIBLICAL CRITICISM

BY

MILTON S. TERRY, D.D., LL.D.
Professor in Garrett Biblical Institute

10/12/62 S 61 T (Pents)

BETHEL COLLEGE &
SEMINARY LIBRARY
ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA

NEW YORK: EATON & MAINS
CINCINNATI: JENNINGS & PYE

Copyright by
EATON & MAINS,
1901.

061623

S02301

T329

PREFACE.

It is the purpose of this little volume to furnish a much-needed statement of some of the rights and reasons of modern biblical criticism. The author has no desire and feels no call to propagate any particular views touching the origin and dates of Old Testament writings, but he feels compelled by the holiest vows of his ministry to maintain the fundamental principle of Protestant Christianity in the free and fearless but reverent investigation of the Holy Scriptures. There are those who speak of higher criticism as "destructive" without taking care to tell us what they mean by higher criticism, or what things in particular it destroys. No sober mind can be hostile to a criticism which is simply and solely a thoroughgoing inquiry after the truth, and which results in the destruction of certain traditions of Jewish scribes, priests, and elders, which cannot prove their claims, and against which a great many strong reasons are urged. On the contrary, it ought to be conceded that such destruction of old errors must needs be of much advantage and profit every way. The questions under discussion have no vital connection with the essential elements of the Christian faith. What some very positive Christian people need most of all to learn is that *there are not a few things about the history of the Bible* which we would all like to know, but *which are not known and are now past finding out.* It is far better on such matters to reach a negative conclu-

sion, and *come to know that we do not know some things* long supposed to be known, than stubbornly persist in affirming old traditions which learned and conscientious biblical scholars all over the world are more and more coming to reject. The plain fact is that the authorship and date of most of the writings of the Old Testament are matters of extreme uncertainty. Christian congregations have been told perhaps a thousand times that David wrote the twenty-third psalm while he was yet a shepherd lad, and the statement has seemed to add a secret charm to the beautiful idyllic song. But what truth or interest of religion can possibly be aided by persistent affirmation of such a conjecture in face of the fact that a devout critic and scholar like Dr. Adam Clarke writes as follows at the beginning of his comments on this psalm: "There is nothing in particular in the title; it is simply attributed to David; but as it appears to be a thanksgiving of the Israelites for their redemption from the Babylonian captivity, it cannot with propriety be attributed to David. Some think it was written by David in his exile, which is not likely; others that he penned it when he was finally delivered from the persecution of Saul. I rather incline to the opinion that it was written after the captivity"? After this comment (and many of similar character that might be cited from other authors) it ought to be tolerably clear to a thoughtful student that *nobody knows who wrote this psalm.* In his *Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures* the learned and conservative Dr. Harman tells us that the Book of Ecclesiastes is without much doubt "the latest book of the canon, and could not have been written earlier than the time of Malachi; but in all probability it was written still later." And thus he and most of the biblical scholars of our time "destroy" the old tradi-

tion and belief that this book was written by Solomon "the son of David, king in Jerusalem." In the main, the reasons for these conclusions of higher criticism are simple and intelligible, and it seems not only right but expedient that all intelligent students of the Scriptures should be made familiar with them.

In the Episcopal Address delivered in Chicago at the General Conference of May, 1900, the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church condemned, as all right-minded people ought to condemn, "individual eccentricities of thought," and all that savors of "sciolism, self-sufficiency, love of novelty, and the iconoclastic spirit in biblical studies;" but they at the same time emphatically declared that, "beyond the limits of the central and constitutive verities of the Christian faith, Methodism has never insisted on uniformity of thought or statement. It has allowed freedom of reverent inquiry. It adopts Mr. Wesley's words: '*As to all opinions which do not strike at the root of Christianity, we think and let think.*' . . . Serious, conservative, patient, and practical study of the many undetermined questions of theology, questions which chiefly concern, not the facts, but the methods, of divine revelation and government—this study the Church allows and approves."

In a symposium on "the higher criticism," published in the *Rocky Mountain Christian Advocate* of March 30, 1900, eight of these same bishops speak as follows in answer to the double question whether such criticism is (1) necessarily detrimental to evangelical religion, and (2) what should be the attitude of the theological seminaries toward it. The answers are here given in the alphabetical order of the names:

BISHOP E. G. ANDREWS: "Higher criticism is often conducted irreverently and recklessly, and when so conducted induces unbelief and irreligion. But the discussion of the date, authorship,

integrity, and religious value of the several books of the Bible must go on. It cannot be avoided. Our theological schools must deal with these topics; but they should do it with due deference to the wisdom of the past, in a constructive, and not in a destructive, spirit and method, avoiding hasty conclusions and the love of speculative novelties, and holding fast to eternal and vital truths."

BISHOP C. H. FOWLER: "The relation of higher criticism to evangelical religion depends on the spirit with which it is approached. It must be treated like old German rationalism—as an enemy. Watched, to receive all truth, but no mere opinions. Never forgetting that literary criticism is only a shadow; otherwise it would be detrimental. The theological seminaries should meet it with profound scholarship, take only clear truth, putting supernatural claims and power of divine revelation at their best, giving them the chance of a full and fair hearing, making destructive criticism prove beyond doubt before its claims are conceded."

BISHOP J. F. HURST: "In my view, criticism, which is higher in self-esteem and in supercilious contempt for the supernatural than in reverence for divinely revealed truth and for sacred associations, is destructive of evangelical religion; but criticism, high in accuracy, open to all facts of experience and history, and joined to a devout and reverent spirit, will promote evangelical religion. Our theological seminaries may well be on vigilant guard against the former, and may with wide open doors welcome the latter."

BISHOP W. F. MALLALIEU: "Higher criticism is of two kinds: the historical evangelical, and the destructive rationalistic. The first is helpful to evangelical religion; the second is baleful in proportion to its intensity. I am friendly to the first; thoroughly antagonistic to the second."

BISHOP C. C. MCCABE: "I think higher criticism is detrimental to evangelical religion because it takes the attention of many of our preachers who should be thinking about how to save the world. Satan always gets up something to turn our minds away from our great business of preaching the word. It was so in Paul's day (1 Tim. i. 4-6). Our Church should not shrink from any tests that may be applied to God's word. But while a few professors are giving attention to these things let the rank and file of the ministry seek to save the world."

BISHOP S. M. MERRILL: "Some higher criticism is detrimental to evangelical religion; some is not. The genuine criticism, high or low, is good; the pretentious is bad. Theological schools should teach pupils to distinguish the true from the destructive, and to avoid all of it in their preaching."

BISHOP W. X. NINDE: "Let reverent critics continue their investigations. Let us carefully sift the chaff from the wheat. Let us hold fast our faith in the precious Bible as the sacred deposition of God's authoritative and eternal truth, in substance of doctrine;

and let us go on with our saving work, never halting, never yielding."

BISHOP J. H. VINCENT: "Some of the results of higher criticism may be damaging to evangelical religion. But the higher criticism as a process must be useful. The surgeon's knife in unskilled hands or in the hands of a drunken, an insane, or a malicious man is an instrument of evil. But what it has wrought when skill and delicacy and love have wielded it! There is nothing that can be known about the theory, the methods, the history, and the results of higher criticism that theological seminaries should not set before their students."

Among all men and women who have the love of Christ in their hearts, and know the power of his Spirit, it ought to go without saying that anything in thought, word, or deed, whether it touch a matter of critical study or of any other procedure, which displays irreverence, contempt for the supernatural, or iconoclastic hostility to the evangelical faith, can expect no favor. But all these bishops, with remarkable and gratifying unanimity, commend and encourage reverent higher criticism. And, indeed, it may well be asked, what other ground can any sensible person occupy? As another writer, not a bishop, in the same symposium remarks: "To deny men the right and privilege to thoroughly investigate the Holy Scriptures in a reverent manner, whatever may be the conclusions to which they are led, is to strike at the fundamental principles of liberty and to antagonize the first principles of Protestantism." Surely these chief shepherds of the Church do not mean to be understood as saying: You must investigate all biblical questions reverently, freely, thoroughly; but if you conscientiously reach conclusions touching the Pentateuch and Isaiah that differ from views that have long been current you must suppress them, or keep silent, or else get out of the Church!

The following pages on Moses and the Prophets will be found to be a reverent and well-considered statement of the views presented. They have been written

in the spirit and manner so cordially indorsed by these chief pastors in the Church, and all they ask for is a fair hearing—an unprejudiced and candid reading. No one is asked to accept them unless fully persuaded in his own mind. No novelties are here presented, but views that have steadily held their way with successive generations of biblical scholars, and have never been refuted, as is witnessed by the fact that to-day they command a wider and more general acceptation than ever before. This little book, moreover, aims to be *constructive and conservative.* We take pains to point out in every chapter the great moral and religious lessons of these ancient Hebrew compositions. We show over and over again that, apart from the critical questions involved, these holy writings inculcate the eternal truths of religion in a most remarkable way. So far from being detrimental to evangelical religion, or unfitting a minister of the Gospel for his highest work, these critical studies ought rather to intensify his zest and enthusiasm for the salvation of men. Thus only will he be able and diligent, as Paul says (2 Tim. ii, 15), to present himself "approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, handling aright the word of truth."

CONTENTS.

PAGE

INTRODUCTORY. 11

CHAPTER I.

DIVINE-HUMAN LAWGIVING. 19

CHAPTER II.

BOOKS OF PROPHETIC HISTORY. 49

CHAPTER III.

BOOKS OF PROPHETIC ORACLES. 79

CHAPTER IV.

COMPILATIONS OF PROPHETIC ORACLES. . . . 109

CHAPTER V.

PARABOLIC PROPHECY. 135

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS. 167

APPENDIX ON NEW TESTAMENT CITATION. . . 175

INDEX. 197

MOSES AND THE PROPHETS.

INTRODUCTORY.

THE sacred books of our religion have had a long and varied history, and they are as remarkable for their wealth of literature as for their adaptation to instruct mankind in ethics and religion. Jerome, the great biblical scholar of the fourth century, was singularly happy in designating the canonical writings of the Old and New Testaments as the DIVINE LIBRARY. The fact that they are a collection of books, written at sundry times and at different places, ought never to be overlooked or ignored. Two hundred years or more before the birth of Christ the books of the Old Testament had been arranged into three classes, known ever since as "the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings." These are the three divisions mentioned in Luke xxiv, 44 as "the Law of Moses, and the Prophets, and the Psalms." The Law of Moses was the popular designation of the first five books of the Bible, now commonly called the Pentateuch. The Prophets embraced two classes of writings, one historical in character, consisting of the Books of

The divine library.

The Law.

The Prophets.

Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, and the other of a more oracular character, consisting of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve Minor Prophets. All the other books, including Ruth, Lamentations, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles, were assigned to the collection of Writings, now often called the Hagiographa. These thirty-six different books, thus distributed into three divisions, constitute to-day as they did two thousand years ago the divine library of the Jewish people.

The Hagiographa.

Just when and how these books were first put together into the threefold divine library in which they now appear in the Hebrew Bible are questions which are very difficult to answer. An exact and final answer need not be expected. There exists to-day no trustworthy external evidence sufficient to settle these questions. But an approximate idea may be formed when we learn that the collecting of the sacred books of Israel, and the arranging of them in three great volumes or classes as described above, were the work of Ezra and the Jewish scribes after the return from the Babylonian exile. But this work was not completed in one generation. There is no evidence of any *collection* of books, holding the position and authority of a canon of Scripture, previous to the days of Ezra and Nehemiah. Ezra's proficiency "in the law of Moses, which Jehovah, God of Israel, gave" (Ezra vii, 6), and his public exposition of that law in the days of Nehemiah, are attested in the seventh chapter of the Book

Date of the canonical arrangement.

Ezra.

of Ezra and in the eighth chapter of Nehemiah. But there is nothing in those records to show how far the various Mosaic laws had, previous to that time, been codified. Later Jewish traditions magnify the work of Ezra the scribe, declare that he restored from memory all the sacred books which had been lost during the exile, and honor him as a second Moses worthy to have been the first lawgiver.[1]

A book of the law.

But while we find no evidence of a canonical collection of books before the exile, we read in 2 Kings xxii, 8-11, of the discovery, by Hilkiah the priest, of a "book of the law." It was at once recognized as a book of divine authority, containing the words of a covenant and referred to as the Law of Moses (2 Kings xxiii, 2, 21, 25). There is nothing said in connection with this discovery to inform us concerning the origin and history of the book up to that time. But whatever its authorship, extent, and date our present interest is to note that it had for the king and people the authority of Mosaic law.

Other books.

Besides this book of the law, there were extant at the time numerous national psalms, and histories, and the writings of such prophets as Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah. But none of these appear to have been as yet arranged in one collection, or recognized as a canon of Scripture. Each prophet spoke or wrote on his own separate authority, and his word was heeded or rejected by the different

[1] See, for example, the second book of Esdras in the Old Testament Apocrypha, chapter xiv.

individuals according to their will. The words of Huldah the prophetess (in 2 Kings xxii, 15-20) seem to have had for the king an inspiration and power no less impressive than those of the book of the law.

But neither the book of the law nor the word of the Lord by the prophets proved sufficient to turn the people from their evil ways, and in the next generation after Josiah the kings and people of Judah lapsed into their former disobedience and were carried away into Babylonian exile. Jeremiah prophesied and was bitterly persecuted during this last period of the kingdom of Judah, and Ezekiel the priest, one of the captives in Babylon, prophesied during the earlier period of the exile. The closing chapters of his book (especially xl-xlviii) contain an ideal sketch for a new temple and more perfect priesthood and ceremonial to be realized after the complete restoration from the lands of captivity. How far any codification of ancient laws and plans looking to the formation of a biblical canon were undertaken during the years of exile is a matter of pure conjecture, but the first certain results of a definite character are to be learned from the chapters in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah already mentioned. There is now little or no question among the scholars who occupy the chairs of Hebrew learning that the Pentateuch, in its present form, was brought to completion about the time of Ezra, and was the first canon of Scripture to be recognized as such by the Jewish people.

Codification during the exile.

In the apocryphal book of Second Maccabees we are

told (chap. ii, 13) that Nehemiah "founded a library, and gathered together the books about the kings and prophets, and the books of David, and letters of kings about sacred gifts. And in like manner Judas also gathered together for us all those writings that had been scattered by reason of the war that befell, and they are still with us." This statement is valuable as evincing the care which postexilian Jewish leaders showed to preserve the national literature, but it does not claim that Nehemiah formed (much less completed) the canon of the prophets. The second great division of the Jewish canon could not have been completed until after the time of Malachi, who appears to have been a contemporary of Nehemiah. No book was likely to have been canonized until some time after the death of its author.

Library of Nehemiah.

As for the third division, called the "Writings," we know that as late as the first century of our era some of the rabbis were yet discussing the sacredness of Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, and the Book of Esther. The entire collection as we now have it could not have reached completion until after the time of the Maccabees. Psalms lxxiv and lxxix, not to mention others, are most naturally explained as originating in those troublous days. The approximate dates, accordingly, between which we must assign the formation of the Old Testament canon, are B. C. 450-100. The prologue of the Book of Ecclesiasticus (or Wisdom of Jesus, the Son of Sirach) contains the most ancient testimony to the threefold divi-

Approximate dates.

sion, but its indefinite manner of mentioning the third division, as "the others," "the other books of our fathers," and "the rest of the books," when compared with "the Law of Moses, and the Prophets, and the Psalms" of Luke xxiv, 44, suggests that the limits of the third canon had become more definitely fixed at the beginning of our era than in the time of the son of Sirach. And yet the single word *Psalms* for the third division affords no certain information touching all the books that were then included under that specific designation.

Psalms.

It will be apparent, from these considerations, that the codification of the various laws, the compiling, editing, and arranging of the various books, and bringing them all together in one sacred library, were matters quite distinct from the authorship and dates of the several writings. The narrative and historical portions of the Pentateuch are not necessarily the oldest compositions of the Bible. The history of the origin and development of the national life of Israel is not to be determined by the canonical order of the sacred books. As the five books of psalms which now constitute the Hebrew Psalter contain some of the earliest as well as some of the latest odes of Israel, so the five books of the law may be found to contain postexilian elements of the time of Ezra as well as laws and records as old as the days of Moses. So also the second, or prophetic, canon contains writings separated from each other by the space of nearly a thousand years.

Inferences from the order of books in the canon.

We shall endeavor in the following pages to direct the reader to a profitable study of the first two divisions named above, namely, the Law and the Prophets. Moses is a unique personality that stands forth without a superior in the history of Israel. The beginnings of the national life and all subsequent legislation are associated with his name. He is as conspicuously the lawgiver as David is the psalmist of Israel. The Jews were wont to say, "Moses gave us five books of Law, David five books of Psalms. The Law is the word of Jehovah to his people; the Psalms are the response of his people to Jehovah." It does not follow, however, that the five books of Moses, so called, are any more truly the composition of the great lawgiver than the five books of psalms are the composition of David. We shall attempt in our first chapter to point out the broad scope and value of the literature which has become associated inseparably with the name of Moses.

Moses.

CHAPTER I.

DIVINE-HUMAN LAWGIVING.

Great Lawgiver and Prince of Israel,
  Around thy name perennial ivies climb;
  Thou standest on thy mount alone, sublime;
All generations feel the lasting spell
Of thy divine legation, and shall tell
  The ages of the wonders of thy time.
Above the work of scribes that penned thy Law,
  And wrote the story of thy grand career,
  And greater than the words of any seer
Whose eye into the changing future saw,
  Thy Tables of Ten Words inspire a fear
Of the Most High, and deepen love with awe;
  And Horeb's flame of fire and Pisgah's height
  Still keep thine eye undimmed, thy face forever bright.

CHAPTER I.

MOSES THE LAWGIVER.

THE story of Moses's life and works is told incidentally in the last four books of the Pentateuch. Other portions of the Scriptures make frequent mention of his name, and the allusions in Stephen's speech (Acts vii, 20-44) and statements found in the writings of Josephus show that many extra-biblical traditions were current among the Jewish people touching the great founder and lawgiver of their nation. It would be, in fact, difficult, if not impossible, to exaggerate the real influence of the ministry of Moses. He was the divinely chosen deliverer of his people from the bondage of Egypt, their military chieftain during the wanderings in the desert, the mediator between Jehovah and the nation, the honored lawgiver, the intimate friend of God, and a prophet of the very highest order. The period of his life is remarkable for its extent and threefold division. His one hundred and twenty years are depicted as falling into these periods of forty years. The first was spent in Egypt, where, tradition says, he became a man of vast learning and of mighty words and deeds (Acts vii, 22, 23). The second was a time of retirement from the world, during which he lived the quiet, meditative life of a shepherd in the land of Midian. He was a venerable octogenarian

Importance of Moses's work.

when he demanded of Pharaoh the liberty of Israel (Exod. vii, 7), and the remaining forty years of his life were contemporaneous with the events of the exodus, the wanderings in the desert, and the march to the borders of the Jordan (Deut. xxxi, 2; xxxiv, 7). There is an ideality of perfection about these three times forty years that corresponds with the greatness and grandeur of the entire biblical portraiture of his work as the founder of the theocratic nation.[1]

Moses and Confucius.

It has been common to compare Moses and Confucius. Both occupy the first rank as honored teachers of great nations; but Confucius claimed to be only a transmitter of ancient laws and traditions, while Moses was rather the organizer of his nation. The Hebrew lawgiver, however, also received and promulgated various laws which were not by him first given to the world, but they received through him and his successors a setting so unique and forcible that the decalogue of Sinai has no equal rival in the annals of human legislation. A study of the Mosaic legislation may well begin with the ten commandments, but as they exist in varying texts in Exodus and Deuteronomy, and as several codes of different cast and date are traceable in the so-called Books of Moses,

[1] How much of symbolism rather than mathematical accuracy lies in such rounded numbers in the Old Testament may be an open question with interpreters. Truth-loving students of the Scriptures, who have patiently gone through the labored calculations of various schemes of "biblical chronology," and endured the assumptions and presumptions, not to speak of the downright impositions, of writers who insist on the literal and mathematical correctness of all statements involving extravagant numbers found in the Bible, ought to be treated at least with leniency when they hesitate to accept dogmatic expositions of these numbers.

all intelligent readers of the Bible are entitled to have the facts set before them, and to know the grounds on which so many biblical scholars of the present time maintain that the Pentateuch as we now have it is not the composition of Israel's first lawgiver.[1] Our limits allow only a few representative examples.

1. In the first place, let us look at the statements of the books themselves. There is not a word in the Book of Genesis to show us who the author was. Most of its contents refer to things which occurred centuries and millenniums before the time of Moses. In Exodus, however, we find a few passages where it is said that Moses made a record. In xvii, 14, Jehovah is represented as commanding him to write a memorial of the war with Amalek "in the book, and rehearse it in the ears of Joshua: that I will utterly blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven." In xxiv, 4, it is said that "Moses wrote all the words of Jehovah," and in verse 7 that "he took the book of the covenant, and read in the ears of the people." Again, in xxxiv, 27, 28, we are told that "he wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments." But all these passages combined

Who wrote Genesis.

[1] It is not the purpose of this little volume to disprove the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, or the traditional authorship of any other writing of the Old Testament. For such an object our limits would be utterly inadequate; for the details of this question touch every chapter and almost every paragraph of the Pentateuch, to say nothing of the Prophets. Our main purpose is rather to offset the persistent one-sidedness of writers who seem incapable of stating fairly the main reasons which modern higher criticism has to offer for its conclusions. Our object is, indeed, apologetic for the rights of criticism and of all reverent and thorough biblical research, and to show the hazardous futility of making questions like that of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch a fundamental matter of the Christian religion.

are no conclusive proof that Moses wrote our Book of Exodus. They simply show at most that he made record of the things there specified. "The words of the covenant" are in the last-cited text expressly said to be the ten commandments. All the rest of the Book of Exodus is cast in narrative form, in which Moses is spoken of in the third person, and it may have been written centuries after Moses's death by a scribe who had access to the facts and documents employed.

Who wrote Exodus.

The same may be said of Leviticus and Numbers. Much is said about Moses and his legislation, and in Num. xxxiii we have memoranda of "the journeys of the children of Israel," which it is said Moses wrote (verse 2). But there is no claim or evidence that he wrote the books as a whole. The Book of Deuteronomy consists of a series of discourses attributed to Moses, but they are set in an historical framework in which Moses is spoken of in the third person, and in the last chapter his death and burial are recorded. In chapter xxxi, 9, 24-26, it is said that "Moses wrote this law, and delivered it unto the priests" to deposit in the ark of the covenant. But the limits of "this law" are indefinite, and it cannot be proven that either Moses or the priests ever put in the ark any other or larger book of the covenant than that referred to in Exod. xxxiv, 28, namely, the ten commandments. In 1 Kings viii, 9, it is declared that there was nothing else in the ark at the time of the dedication of the temple. So far, therefore, as the sev-

Authorship of Leviticus and Deuteronomy.

eral books of the Pentateuch testify for themselves, we find nothing to show that Moses was the author of any one of them. But inasmuch as he is the great hero and central personage around whom the narrative groups the more important events and laws, it was very natural that these writings were called from the first the Books of Moses. So, too, the Books of Joshua and Samuel were called after the names of the great heroes whose acts they record, but the date and authorship of those books are as uncertain as the composition of the Pentateuch.

2. In the next place, the student of these books should examine the internal evidences of their composite character. Long ago it was discovered that the Book of Genesis employed the divine names *Elohim* and *Jehovah*[1] in such a peculiar manner as to suggest diverse authorship for the different sections which were characterized by the use of one of these names rather than the other. It was accordingly argued that the book was compiled out of two preexistent documents, whose authors were designated as the Jehovist and the Elohist, and often only by the initial letters of these names, J and E. Continued research has shown evidence of three different sources from which the material of Genesis has been derived, and these sources are found to contain other indications

Divine names in Genesis.

[1] These names are represented in our common English Bibles by God and LORD. Even the English revisers of the common version were unwilling to insert the name of Jehovah (now commonly pronounced by Hebrew scholars *Yahweh*) where it occurs in the Hebrew text, and they retained the word LORD, the small capitals indicating this fact.

of diverse authorship besides the peculiar use of the divine names. They differ in style of thought and language as noticeably as two different writers are ever found to differ; they exhibit variations of statement which, if not real discrepancies or contradictions, are of a nature to indicate the work of different writers; and there is a number of duplicate accounts of the same events which correspond with the other differences named and confirm the analysis which assigns the distinctive original documents.[1] Thus the first and second chapters of Genesis contain two divergent accounts of the creation, one supplementary to the other, and each exhibiting conspicuous differences of style, variations of statement, and a uniformly distinctive use of the names Elohim and Jehovah. So again we find in Exod. vi, 2-7, a parallel but divergent account of the call and commission of Moses, which is believed to have been taken from a source different from that of chapter iii. The compiler of the Pentateuch seems thus to have appropriated and distributed his documentary sources to suit his own purpose of composition.

Different styles of thought and language.

Repetitions.

[1] The English reader who would see the main sources of the Pentateuch and Joshua printed separately, so as to be read as independent writings, would do well to study *The Documents of the Hexateuch, Translated and Arranged in Chronological Order*, with introduction and notes by W. E. Addis (published by Putnam's Sons, New York, 1893). But a more complete apparatus for this same field of study is *The Hexateuch According to the Revised Version, Arranged in its Constituent Documents by Members of the Society of Historical Theology, Oxford*. Edited with introduction, notes, marginal references, and synoptical tables, by J. E. Carpenter and G. Harford-Battersby. 2 vols. London, 1900.

This composite character of the Pentateuch is now generally conceded, and becomes very apparent to anyone who takes pains to analyze the structure of such passages as Gen. vii and viii, where we read the duplicate account of the deluge; and the first fourteen chapters of Exodus, in which the documents known as J, E, and P have been combined so as to indicate in not a few places the marks of a triple narrative of the great events connected with Israel's departure from Egypt. On this matter it may suffice to present the testimony of the distinguished orientalist A. H. Sayce:

Composite structure now generally conceded.

"One of the most assured results of the literary analysis of the Old Testament records has been the existence of documents of different age and authorship in the Pentateuch. Opinions may differ widely as to the authorship of certain passages, and the dates to which the several documents are to be assigned, but about the general fact of the composite character of the Pentateuch competent critics of all schools are now agreed. The literary foundation upon which the history and religion of Israel rested is, in its present form, a composite work."[1] This writer goes on to instance in illustration the Egyptian "Book of the Dead," in which are found embodied contrary beliefs and diversities of view like those "which criticism has indicated between the two accounts of creation given in the first two chapters of Genesis." The same fact meets us in the sacred

[1] *The Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments*, p. 31, Second ed, London, 1894.

literature of Babylonia. And so we are assured by this high authority, who shows no friendly attitude to "higher criticism," that "the composite character of the Pentateuch is only what a study of similar contemporaneous literature brought to light by modern research would lead us to expect. The higher criticism of the Pentateuch has thus been justified in its literary analysis of the Books of Moses."

3. Another fact to be noticed before proceeding to a study of Mosaic legislation is the distribution of the various laws into three distinguishable codes—the Sinaitic, the Deuteronomic, and the Levitical.

(1) The first includes the ten commandments, as in Exod. xx, 1-17, and the collection of statutes which are written in Exod. xx, 22-xxiii, 33. These laws are supposed to have constituted "the book of the covenant" mentioned in Exod. xxiv, 7. But the ten commandments stand apart from all other laws as God's own testimony. There is nothing in all the history, legends, and myths of lawgiving among the nations that is comparable with the sublime picture of the giving of the decalogue at Sinai as given in Exod. xix and xx. And the marvelous perfection of this summary of moral law, its intrinsic excellency, the universal applicability of the several precepts, and their abiding and unchangeable nature, place these commandments in advance of anything to be found elsewhere in the annals of human legislation. These are a summary of divine revelation so absolutely fundamental and comprehensive that on them hang all

Book of the covenant and the Sinaitic Code.

the law and the prophets (Matt. xxii, 40). They are grounded in the very nature of man as a moral being, and take due cognizance of his essential relations to God on the one hand and to his fellow-man on the other.

The ten commandments are accordingly divisible into two tables, and they are most simply and naturally arranged in five precepts for each table. Parallel with the record in Exod. xx, 2-17, is that of Deut. v, 6-21. A comparison of the two texts of these parallel passages shows that in their present expanded form they are somewhat independent of each other.[1] They seem to have a number of hortatory additions, which, perhaps, were not a part of "the ten words" as first enunciated. Separated from these supposable additions we may see the substance of the two tables in their more original form expressed thus:

Expanded forms of the ten words.

FIRST TABLE.

1. Thou shalt have no other gods before me.
2. Thou shalt not make for thyself any graven image.
3. Thou shalt not take the name of God in vain.
4. Observe the Sabbath day to sanctify it.
5. Honor thy father and thy mother.

SECOND TABLE.

6. Thou shalt not kill.
7. Thou shalt not commit adultery.
8. Thou shalt not steal.
9. Thou shalt not bear false witness.
10. Thou shalt not covet.

In addition to these most fundamental laws the com-

[1] Thus the reason for observing the Sabbath day in Exod. xx, 11, is different from that assigned in Deut. v, 15. Other variations in the phraseology of the two texts are noticeable.

mandments of the book of the covenant, in Exod. xx, 22-xxiii, 19, are put forth as definitive and supplementary. They touch upon a great variety of matters, and are scarcely susceptible of any clear systematic arrangement. Beginning with a prohibition of idolatrous images in xx, 23, we find next, in verses 24-26, the law concerning the construction of altars in the places where God shall record his name.[1] Then follow laws touching the relations of masters and servants (xxi, 1-11), personal assaults and injuries (12-27), goring oxen (28-32), losses of cattle (33-36), cattle-stealing (xxii, 1-4), cattle feeding in the field of another (5), the kindling of destructive fires (6), stolen or damaged trusts (7-15), seduction (16, 17), witchcraft (18), lying with beasts (19), idolatrous sacrifices (20), treatment of foreigners (21), treatment of widows and fatherless (22-24), loaning money (25), taking garments as a pledge (26, 27), reviling God and rulers (28), devotion of firstlings (29, 30), abstinence from torn flesh (31), perversions of honor and justice (xxiii, 1-3), favor toward enemies (4, 5), judgment of the poor (6), maintaining justice and refusing bribes (7, 8), nonoppression of strangers (9), Sabbath laws (10-12), other gods (13), three annual feasts (14-17), leaven not to be offered with blood (18), fat of sacrifices not to remain over night (18), offering of the firstfruits (19), and prohibition of seething a kid in its mother's milk.

Outline of primitive legislation.

[1] This law for building altars seems somewhat out of place in the connection, and reads like a fragment taken from some other source than that of what precedes and follows.

This outline of legislation is manifestly simple and primitive, and adapted to the needs of an agricultural and pastoral community. In the thirty-fourth chapter of Exodus we have what purports to be a duplicate of this first legislation, or a rewriting of the two tables of the words of the covenant. The laws which are recorded in Exod. xxxiv, 12-26, may be resolved into ten commandments, as follows:

Another ten commandments.

1. Thou shalt make no covenant with the heathen (verse 12).
2. Thou shalt destroy their altars and images (13).
3. Thou shalt worship no other God but Jehovah (14).
4. Thou shalt make thee no molten gods (17).
5. Thou shalt keep the feast of unleavened bread (18).
6. Thou shalt redeem all the firstborn (19, 20).
7. Thou shalt work six days, and rest on the seventh (21).
8. Thou shalt observe the three annual feasts (22, 23).
9. Thou shalt not offer sacrifice with leaven (25).
10. Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk (26).

Inasmuch as these laws seem to be called in verse 28 following "the words of the covenant, the ten commandments," we thus arrange them into a decalogue. But this is not the decalogue of Exod. xx, 3-17, and of Deut. v, 7-21. It contains three of those commandments, and the rest are in the main a repetition of laws already recorded in the book of the covenant (Exod. xxiii, 10-19). By making the nonappearing empty before God in Exod. xxxiv, 20, and the bringing of first fruits in verse 26 separate precepts, we may resolve the whole passage (Exod. xxxiv, 12-26) into a *duodecalogue*. We are not able at this day to explain clearly all

these repetitions of precepts as they are scattered through the Books of Exodus, Leviticus, and Deuteronomy, and the origin of some of them appears to have been independent of the narrative in which they are now inserted. But the collection of commandments and laws thus far noticed may well be called the Sinaitic Code, or the earliest Mosaic legislation. But the codification as it now stands may be of later date than the time of Moses, and yet embody some laws that were ancient before Moses was born.

The Deuteronomic Code.

(2) The next stage in the formal codification of Mosaic law is now generally held to be the Deuteronomic. The substance of this code is found in Deuteronomy, chapters xii-xxvi, and is believed to be the book of the law which Hilkiah discovered in the temple (2 Kings xxii, 8-17). The reasons for this belief are, chiefly, (1) that the book seems to have been a single roll, and not so large but that it was soon read before the king; (2) all the reforms instituted by Josiah find warrant in these chapters of Deuteronomy; and (3) the free use which the author of the Books of Kings makes of the language of Deuteronomy confirms this view.[1] This altogether makes a strong showing, and when we find that the legislation of Deut. xii-xxvi is to a great extent a repetition and expansion of the laws of the Sinaitic Code, and that it also contains a number of provisions notice-

[1] Compare 1 Kings ii, 3, with Deut. xvii, 18-20; 1 Kings viii, 51, with Deut. iv, 20; 1 Kings ix, 3, with Deut. xii, 5; and 1 Kings ix, 7, 8, with Deut. xxviii, 37; xxix, 24.

ably different from what is written in that earlier code, the argument becomes quite demonstrative that in Deuteronomy we have a revised and enlarged presentation of the old Mosaic legislation, and one better adapted to the needs of Israel at a period long subsequent to the time of Moses. But who reformulated these laws and adapted them to the needs of his time, and when and how the book was deposited in the temple, and how long it had lain there before its discovery by Hilkiah are questions which no one can now answer. Its style and subject-matter favor the belief that the legislation of the book was a combination of old Mosaic laws and later prophetic teaching. If the book contained originally only chapters xii-xxvi we must suppose that the rest of the book, as we now have it, was the addition of some later hand—perhaps the result of a number of supplements. Its final redaction, with the account of the death and burial of Moses, would seem to be far more appropriate for Ezra the scribe than for the great lawgiver himself.

Deuteronomic Code and enlargement of Sinaitic.

(3) The Levitical legislation is that elaborate codification of ordinances, ritual of sacrifices, and laws of the sanctuary and priesthood which are now found distributed through the three middle books of the Pentateuch.[1] There exists

Levitical Code.

[1] Its main provisions are found, speaking briefly and without detailed analysis, in Exod. xii, 1-20, xxv-xxxi, xxxv-xl, all of Leviticus (including the section Lev. xvii-xxvi, which because of distinctive peculiarities is often called "the Law of Holiness"), and the legislative portions of the entire Book of Numbers.

no evidence that the great body of these ritual laws were either observed or known before the Babylonian exile. There were priests, and sacrifices, and regulations of the temple and of the older sanctuary before it, but neither Amos nor Hosea gives any intimation of a knowledge on their part of such an elaborate ritual as a part of the requirements of Jehovah. On the contrary, Amos employs language inconsistent with the idea that such a ritual had been ordained in the days of Moses (see Amos v, 21-26). Similar sentiments are found in Mic. vi, 7, 8; Isa. i, 11-17, and especially in Jer. vii, 21-26. Here are not only implications, but the positive declaration that in the day that God rescued Israel from Egypt he gave them no commandment touching burnt offering and sacrifices—that is, he did not enjoin any such offerings as indispensable to a righteous life, or give them the prominence which they acquired at a later stage of Israel's history.

Date of Levitical law.

The results of the most careful critical study on this subject are tending toward increasing unanimity that the elaborate code of Levitical regulations, as recorded in the middle books of the Pentateuch, was not brought to completion until some time after the return of the Jews from Babylonian exile. They first became a recognized law of Mosaic authority in connection with the worship of the second temple, and mainly by the efficient ministry of Ezra and his colaborers. In the later Jewish traditions Ezra holds a rank hardly second to Moses.

It was not until after the nation had been most

severely disciplined by the chastisements of God, and after the great lawgiver had in name and personality become canonized in the songs, the traditions, and the hearts of the people of Israel for a thousand years, that "the law of Moses" became fully recognized both as a national constitution and a most holy scripture. As the voice of the prophets was about to cease,[1] there was need that their written words be canonized and made a permanent testimony of God for the instruction of the people. So also, in the New Testament times, it was not until after the Lord Jesus and his apostles had passed away that the need was felt of canonizing the most trustworthy written reports of the great Teacher's deeds and words, and the writings of his first and greatest apostles.

Canonization of names and records.

Accordingly, after the return from exile and after the rebuilding and dedication of the new temple at Jerusalem the great leaders of the Jewish nation saw the necessity of an authoritative Scripture for the religious discipline of the people of God. As Jewish tradition ascribes the restoration of the law to Ezra as truly as it attributes its origin to Moses, we best satisfy all the internal and

Necessity of the canon.

[1] At the time Psa. lxxiv was written it seems there was "no more any prophet" in the land (verse 9). Verse 8 of that psalm implies the existence of synagogue services, and with good reason the prevailing criticism of our time assigns the psalm to the time of the Maccabees. The only other period when it would seem to be suitable was that of the Chaldean invasion under Nebuchadnezzar, but at that time the great prophet Jeremiah was in the land; and during the exile and for a generation after some of the greatest prophecies of the Old Testament were written.

external evidences of the composition of the Pentateuch by the hypothesis that it received its present form at the hand of that divinely anointed and proficient priest and "scribe of the words of the commandments of Jehovah, and of his statutes to Israel" (Ezra vii, 11). He had at command a vast Hebrew literature now lost to us.[1] He incorporated the old Sinaitic legislation of the book of the covenant, and its various modifications and redactions, together with the Deuteronomic Code discovered by Hilkiah; and adding to these the later elaborations of the Levitical Code, and a continuous historical narrative running from the creation of Adam to the burial of Moses, he distributed the various laws and recorded them in the manner in which they have remained since his day. To him and his colaborers we may ascribe the gathering up of old traditions and written documents, the genealogies of the fathers, and the great poems which are referred to Jacob and Moses and others, and combining them all in the fivefold volume which thereafter was most appropriately called "the Book of the Law of Moses." In the light of these considerations it ought not to be difficult for us to see that a postexilian composition of the Pentateuch is by no

Late date consistent with Mosaic origin.

[1] The extent of Hebrew literature once extant and independent of our canonical books, not to speak of such sources as critical analysis now discovers in the J, E, D, and P of the Hexateuch, may be inferred from the incidental reference to the "Book of the Wars of Jehovah" in Num. xxi, 14, and the "Book of Jasher" in Josh. x, 13, and 2 Sam. i, 18. Compare also the "Book of the Acts of Solomon" (1 Kings xi, 41), and the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel and Judah (1 Kings xiv, 19, 29), "Book of Gad the Seer" (1 Chron. xxix, 29), "Book of Shemaiah the Prophet" (2 Chron. xii, 15), "Story of the Prophet Iddo" (2 Chron. xiii, 22), and "Book of Jehu the Son of Hanani" (2 Chron. xx, 34).

means inconsistent with a Mosaic origin and warrant for its manifold laws.

Turning now to a more particular examination of this fivefold volume as a whole, we observe first that the Book of Genesis is of the nature of a great national epic, lying at the basis of the entire biblical revelation. It gives in a series of charming word pictures a lofty theistic ideal of God in creation, and in the beginnings and developments of human life both in prehistoric and in the most ancient historic times. With the call of Abraham we see the origin of the Hebrew people, and trace it onward for centuries through the many vicissitudes of patriarchal and tribal outgrowth. The bondage of Egypt and the deliverance therefrom prepare the way for national organization and the divine legation of Moses. The last four books of the Pentateuch, as we have seen, are inseparably associated with the mission and name of this great man of God.

Genesis an epic.

In this magnificent outline of the origin and development of the Israelitish people we have a didactic illustration of the manner in which God makes a nation. Here we may study the philosophy of human society, and find all the essential principles of a most elevating sociology. We trace the origin of the Jewish nation back to one man, whom God separates from his country and kindred, and leads westward to become the father of a peculiar people. His family grows and strengthens into a community of powerful tribes bound together by peculiar ties. The

The founding of a nation.

bondage of Egypt united them in the indissoluble affection of a common ancestry, a common suffering, a common religion, and common hopes and fears. With their successful sympathetic strike for independence and their triumphant march "out of the house of bondage," they feel the dawning consciousness of a national unity, and proceed to conquer and possess the land which the Most High points out to them as their inheritance (comp. Deut. xxxii, 8). After numerous wars and oppressions they organize themselves into a monarchy and become a state. Their laws are enacted and modified from time to time, as new occasions offer and as new needs arise. Great national odes are composed and sung until they become familiar as household words. Sketches of great events are written, ancient traditions are enlarged and embellished, the great heroes of the past are glorified in song and story, the religion of the nation calls forth many a psalm and oracle of devotion, and so a great national literature comes into circulation. And thus, by degrees, all interests that affect human society receive development and cultivation. Matters pertaining to religion, education, various arts and industries, and political institutions are directed and shaped in the providence of God according to the enterprise, piety, and intelligence of the great body of the people, or of their leaders, or of both. In the devout study of these various factors we perceive "God in history."

The building of a nation.

In order, now, to appreciate the scope and wisdom of the several codes, and especially of the more ancient

legislation, the student of the Scripture must give some patient study to details of "commandments, and statutes, and judgments, and ordinances," as they have found embodiment in the Pentateuch. It is somewhat difficult to classify the Pentateuchal laws. Aside from the great body of ceremonial and priestly ordinances peculiar to the Levitical Code there exists in the Pentateuch a great outline of political economy. We find agrarian laws, regulations touching property and inheritance, criminal statutes, police regulations, sanitary laws, marriage and divorce laws, laws of kinship and personal relations, of masters and slaves, of debt and release from debt, of stolen or damaged trusts, of trespasses, of witchcraft, of usury, and of the treatment of aliens. In view of the separateness of Israel among the nations, and of their peculiar mission as Jehovah's people, we do not look for any doctrines of international law in the Mosaic legislation. The Levitical regulations, on the other hand, are so numerous, minute, and peculiar to the Jewish people, and have to do with their ceremonial worship subsequent to the exile, that we omit them from the following summary of Mosaic legislation, which is designed to point out the remarkable comprehensiveness of the system of jurisprudence embodied in the Pentateuch. In presenting this summary for the convenience of the reader we simply aim to classify the various laws in an orderly way, and without specific reference to their position in the Sinaitic, the Deuteronomic, or the Levitical Code. We take them as a whole,

Classification of laws.

and arrange them under the two main heads of constitutional and municipal laws. Thus arranged they become impressive by reason of their variety and scope, and they are very suggestive of fundamental truths in the philosophy of civil government.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW.

1. Jehovah-God is the founder of the nation, its sovereign ruler and judge, and the one sole object of worship. Exod. xx, 2; Deut. vi, 5, 13; x, 12, 20.
2. The land of Israel is a God-given inheritance, and may not be alienated. Gen. xiii, 15; Deut. xii, 10; Lev. xxv, 23-34, and xxvii, 14-34.
3. The powers of legislation and government are vested in various classes of persons or officers ordained of God.
   (1) Patriarch was king and priest of his family (Noah, Abraham, Melchizedek, Jethro).
   (2) Moses the first great lawgiver and national judge.
   (3) Elders, associated judges, and subordinate officers. Exod. xviii, 19-26; Deut. i, 12-15; Num. xi, 16, 17; Deut. xvi, 18.
   (4) Priests and judges a court of appeals. Deut. xvii, 8-12.
   (5) A limited monarchy if desired. Deut. xvii, 14-20.
4. Security of personal rights.
   (1) Punishment to be personal and not transferred or entailed. Deut. xxiv, 16.
   (2) Two or three witnesses necessary to convict. Num. xxxv, 30; Deut. xvii, 6; xix, 15.
   (3) Provision of cities of refuge. Num. xxxv, 9-34; Deut. xix, 2-13.
   (4) Divine prerogative of avenging all human guilt not subject to human jurisdiction, but reserved by God. Exod. xx, 5; xxxiv, 7; Num. xiv, 18; Deut. xxxii, 35.

MUNICIPAL LAW.

1. Laws of Marriage and Divorce.

1. The primordial law of monogamy. Gen. ii, 24.
2. Husband to hold chief authority. Gen. iii, 16; Num. xxx, 8-16.

3. Unlawful marriages. Lev. xviii, 6-18.
4. Levirate law. Deut. xxiv, 5-10.
5. Newly married man exempt from war. Deut. xxiv, 5.
6. The slave wife. Exod. xxi, 3-11.
7. The captive wife. Deut. xxi, 10-14.
8. Law of bigamy. Deut. xxi, 15-17.
9. Law of divorce. Deut. xxiv, 1-4.

2. Laws touching Parents and Children.

1. Honor of father and mother. Exod. xx, 12; Lev. xix, 3; Deut. v, 16; xxvii, 16.
2. Authority of a father over a daughter's vows. Num. xxx, 3-5.
3. The selling of daughters for bondmaids. Exod. xxi, 7-11.
4. No authority over the life of a rebellious son. Deut. xxi 18-21.
5. Duty of instructing children. Gen. xviii, 19; Deut. iv, 9; vi, 7, 20; xi, 19.

3. Laws touching Master and Slave.[1]

1. Conditions and rights of a Hebrew bondman. Exod. xxi, 2-6; Deut. xiv, 12-18.
2. A man may be sold for theft. Exod. xxii, 3.
3. How a Hebrew may become a bondman. Lev. xxv, 25-28, 39-43.
4. May become the bondman of a stranger and be redeemed. Lev. xxv, 47-55.
5. Slaves from among the heathen. Lev xxv, 44-46.
6. Fugitive slave not to be given up. Deut. xxiii, 15, 16.
7. Freedom to be given for personal injuries. Exod. xxi, 26, 27.

[1] A comparison of the three codes in the matter of slavery serves as a notable illustration of the improbability of all these statutes originating with Moses, or in one generation. Exod xxi, 4, forbids liberation of the slave wife and children when the slave himself may go out free, and verses 20 and 21 evince like barbarity. But the corresponding law of Deut. xv, 12-18, is of a remarkably milder cast, provides for the bondwoman the same as for the bondman, and rebukes the system of slavery itself by referring to the cruel bondage of Egypt. Deut. xxiii, 15, also forbids the delivery of a fugitive slave that has escaped from his master. But so far advanced is the Priestly Code of Lev. xxv, 39ff., as virtually to disallow any real slavery among the Hebrews. Only "as a hired servant" can one temporarily sell himself, and every one must go free at the year of jubilee. Compare Neh. v, 5, 8. That Moses should have enacted all these statutes in one generation, when as yet there was not a slave in Israel, and the whole nation was but a body of emancipated serfs, is highly improbable.

8. Valued, in case of death by an ox, at thirty shekels of silver. Exod. xxi, 32.
9. Death of a slave by punishment not a capital crime. Exod. xxi, 20, 21.

4. Laws touching Property.

(a. Real.)

1. The land, being God's, cannot be alienated. Lev. xxv, 23, 28.
2. The land to be divided by lot. Num. xxvi, 52-56; xxxiii, 54.
3. Of the redemption of possessions temporarily sold. Lev. xxv, 25-34.
4. Of property made over to the priesthood. Lev. xxvii, 14-25.
5. Firstborn son inherits double portion. Deut. xxi, 15-17.
6. Daughters also may receive inheritance. Num. xxvii, 8.
7. When brothers and kinsmen become heirs. Num. xxvii, 9-11.
8. No inheritance to pass from one tribe to another. Num. xxxvi, 6-9.

(b. Personal.)

1. The poor to be paid daily. Deut. xxiv, 15; Lev. xix, 13.
2. Gleanings to be left for the poor. Lev. xix, 9, 10; xxiii, 22; Deut. xxiv, 19-22.
3. Grapes and corn may be eaten on a neighbor's premises, but not taken off. Deut. xxiii, 24, 25.
4. Of interest, usury, and loans. Exod. xxii, 25; Deut. xxiii, 19, 20; Lev. xxv, 35-38.
5. Garments taken in pledge to be returned at sundown. Exod. xxii, 26; Deut. xxiv, 10-13.
6. Millstone not to be pledged. Deut. xxiv, 26.
7. Stray ox of an enemy to be restored, and his fallen beast to be helped. Exod. xxiii, 4, 5. Same law for brothers. Deut. xxii, 1-4.
8. All debts, except of foreigners, to be canceled the seventh year. Deut. xv, 2-11.
9. Law of poll tax. Exod. xxx, 12-16.
10. Law of tithes. Gen. xxviii, 22; Lev. xxvii, 30-33; Num. xviii, 21, 24, 26; Deut. xxvi, 12.

[Observe that nearly all the above laws touching property and taxation are found in the Deuteronomic and Levitical Codes. The only exceptions are those of usury, pledged garments, and strayed or disabled cattle.]

5. Administration of Justice.

1. Judges to be men of ability, loving righteousness. Exod. xviii, 21; Deut. i, 15; xvi, 18.
2. Officers to be reverenced and not reviled. Exod. xxii, 28.
3. Not to respect persons in judgment. Lev. xix, 15; Deut. i, 17; xvi, 18-20.
4. Not to accept bribes. Deut. xvi, 19; Lev. xxiii, 8.
5. To execute righteous judgment. Exod. xxiii, 3, 6, 7; Deut. xix, 18.
6. The law of retaliation (*lex talionis*). Exod. xxi, 22-25; Lev. xxiv, 18-22.
7. Punishment by beating not to exceed forty stripes. Deut. xxv, 1-3.

6. Criminal Laws.

(a. Capital crimes, punishable by stoning.)

1. Murder. Gen. ix, 6; Exod. xx, 13; xxi, 14.
2. Manslaughter. Exod. xxi, 12; Lev. xxiv, 17.
3. Parricide. Exod. xxi, 15.
4. Cursing and incorrigible disobedience of parents. Exod. xxi, 17; Lev. xx, 9; Deut. xxi, 18-21.
5. Manstealing. Exod. xxi, 16; Deut. xxiv, 7.
6. Blasphemy (which was high treason in a theocracy). Exod. xx, 7; Lev. xxiv, 16.
7. Idolatry (another form of like treason). Exod. xx, 3-5; xxii, 20; Deut. xvii, 2-5; Lev. xix, 4; xx, 1-5; xxvi, 1.
8. Seduction to idolatry, and false prophecy. Deut. xiii, 5-11; xviii, 20.
9. Witchcraft. Exod. xxii, 18; Lev. xix, 31; xx, 6, 27; Deut. xviii, 10-12.
10. Adultery. Exod. xx, 14; Lev. xx, 10; Deut. xxii, 22-25.
11. Incest. Lev. xx, 11-14, 17-21.
12. Defilement with a beast. Lev. xviii, 23; xx, 15, 16.
13. Failure to destroy a goring ox. Exod. xxi, 29.
14. Defiling the Sabbath. Exod. xxxi, 14; Num. xv, 32-36.
15. Harlotry concealed from a husband. Deut. xxii, 20, 21.
16. Harlotry of a priest's daughter. Lev. xxi, 9.
17. Sodomy. Deut. xxiii, 17; Lev. xxviii, 22; xx, 13.

(b. Crimes not punishable with death.)

1. Assault and battery. Exod. xxi, 18-25.
2. Theft. Exod. xx, 15; xxii, 1-4, 7-9; Lev. xix, 11.
3. False witness and perjury. Exod. xx, 16; Lev. vi, 2-5.
4. Slander. Exod. xxiii, 1, 7; Deut. xxii, 13-19; Lev. xix, 16.
5. Seduction. Exod. xxii, 16, 17; Deut. xxii, 28, 29.
6. A wife's baseness. Deut. xxv, 11, 12.
7. Carnal intercourse with a bondwoman. Lev. xix, 20-23.

7. Laws pertaining to Damages and Restitution.

1. Of an ox or an ass fallen in a pit. Exod. xxi, 33, 34.
2. Of an ox gored by another. Exod. xxi, 35, 36.
3. Of stolen cattle and money. Exod. xxii, 1, 4, 7-9.
4. Feeding beasts in another's field. Exod. xxii, 5.
5. Kindling fires that damage. Exod. xxii, 6.
6. Loss of borrowed things. Exod. xxii, 14, 15.
7. Cases where no restitution is required. Exod. xxii, 10-13.

8. Ethical and Humanitarian Laws.

1. Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Lev. xix. 18.
2. Care for the widow and the fatherless. Exod. xxii, 22-24.
3. Care for the deaf and blind. Lev. xix, 14; Deut. xxvii, 18.
4. Honor the hoary head. Lev. xix, 32.
5. Kindness to the stranger. Exod. xxii, 21; xxiii, 9; Deut. x, 19; xxvii, 19; Lev. xix, 33, 34.
6. Kindness to the poor. Deut. xv, 7-11; Lev. xxv, 35-38.
7. Kindness in loans and pledges. Exod. xxii, 25-27.
8. Rebuking a neighbor in fault. Lev. xix, 17.
9. The law of gleanings. Deut. xxiv, 19-22; Lev. xix, 9, 10.
10. Restoring lost cattle. Exod. xxiii, 4, 5; Deut. xxii, 1-4.
11. Sparing the mother bird. Deut. xxii, 6, 7.
12. The law of release. Deut. xv, 1-3.
13. Ideal of the year of jubilee. Lev. xxv, 10-16.

Comprehensiveness of Pentateuchal legislation.

The above outline of Pentateuchal legislation, perhaps somewhat imperfect, contains its own exhibition of remarkable comprehensiveness. It covers in substance all the topics which are of fundamental importance in human civilization, and which, in the progress of social and

political economy, call for repeated adjustments to the demands of national interests and the changing conditions of human life. From this unique body of laws, and the theocratic setting they received in the history of Israel, we may now, after the manner of induction, learn the following lessons, which are profitable for all time:

1. According to the Hebrew lawgiver and prophet, God is in all things first and last, Creator, Upholder, Ruler, holy Sovereign. He is the infinite Power back of all things that appear, and he presides as the supreme Intelligence over the natural world as well as over men and nations. His highest law assures the ultimate harmony of the world.

2. Man is by nature a social, moral, and religious being, and no theories of political reform, state rights, national order, or personal liberty which ignore this fundamental truth can be safely trusted in human government.

3. As man is the offspring of God, and the family is a divine institution based on the law of monogamy, so the nation is of divine origin. The Creator has so constituted the social and moral nature of man that in the multiplication of the race the organization of the nation into a body politic becomes a matter of necessity. "If the theologian means," says Burgess, "by his doctrine of the divine origin of the state simply that the Creator of man implanted the substance of the state in the nature of man, the historian will surely be under no necessity to contradict him. The unbiased political historian will not only not dispute this proposition, but he will

teach that the state was brought through the earlier and most difficult periods of its development by the power of religion. . . . The first and most fundamental psychological principle concerned in the development of the state is that of piety—that is, reverence and obedience. Unless the character of the mass of the population be molded by this principle the reign of law can never be attained."[1]

4. We may distinguish between the nation, the state, and the government. The term *nation* points specially to the racial and territorial conditions of a people. It may be composed of one race of common ancestry and language, or of several such races combined under one strong unifying interest. The *state* is necessarily subsequent to the nation, and comes into being by the national recognition of some kind of legal constitution. The state is the politically organized nation. The *government* is the form, policy, or method by which the organized state conducts its affairs.

5. The fundamental principle of all righteous laws is LOVE. The decalogue and all related commandments are reduced by Jesus to the two grand precepts of love, first toward God, and second toward man (Matt. xxii, 37-40). Hence the force of such appeals as Exod. xix, 4-6; xx, 2; Lev. xi, 44; Deut. vi, 4-9. Hence real obedience is not a mere outward conformity to the letter of law, but a matter of the conscience and the heart.

6. Finally, the theocracy, apprehended in its true

[1] *Political Science and Comparative Constitutional Law*, vol. i, pp. 59, 60. Boston, 1891.

ideal of God and human society in harmonious relationship, is a type of the kingdom of God on earth. Its ultimate realization will exhibit the entire human race, as one great family, or brotherhood, dwelling in relations of universal righteousness, peace, and happiness. The Pentateuchal laws, as inclusive of much prophetic teaching, and no little legislation of times subsequent to Moses, constitute a book of revelation and instruction all the more valuable by reason of their covering a greater period of national life and experience than the age of the exodus afforded. But, though supplemented and modified by later men of God, the Sinaitic legislation has given its spirit and power to all the divine revelations that followed it among the Hebrew people, so that the scribe who wrote the closing words of the Pentateuch said most appropriately, "There hath not arisen a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses, whom Jehovah knew face to face."

CHAPTER II.

BOOKS OF PROPHETIC HISTORY.

Of all the annals that impress the mind
With deep convictions of a Higher Power
Working in human history each hour,
And shaping evolutions of mankind,
Most wonderful those ancient books I find
Which chronicle the Hebrew nation's dower
For the religious discipline of man.
The prophet-teachers of the chosen race
Claimed not to know Jehovah face to face;
But they were gifted in his works to scan
Manifold lessons of his heavenly plan,
And marvels of his purposes of grace.
Blessed those unknown prophets who have told
How Israel's God revealed himself of old.

CHAPTER II.

BOOKS OF PROPHETIC HISTORY.

THE second great division of the Jewish canon is entitled THE PROPHETS, and it includes the Books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve Minor Prophets. The Books of Ruth and Lamentations are no part of this collection in the Hebrew Bible, but are assigned to the writings known as Hagiographa. Thus the Prophets stand next in rank to the Law, and are in Jewish thought like the holy place in the temple as compared with the holy of holies. The five books of the Law seem, accordingly, to have attained canonical authority before the prophetic canon was complete, and for that reason, rather than for any superior value of contents or antiquity of composition, they came to hold the first rank. When this second canon was begun, and when completed, no one can now tell. The books as now arranged are divided into two classes, known as Earlier and Later Prophets. The first of these divisions comprises the Books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, and in the present chapter we direct attention to the character and contents of these four great compositions, and bring our study under three heads, namely, the Books, the most notable Characters, and the principal Lessons.

The prophetic canon.

Earlier prophets.

I. THE BOOKS.

The books were classed among the Prophets probably because they were written by prophets, and are so largely devoted to the history and work of the prophetical order in Israel. They are, in fact, historical books, and are commonly so called among us, but they are *history written from the prophetic or theocratic standpoint.* Through them all, as through the other Scriptures, runs a unity of purpose and of general form in which we may trace the gradual unfolding of the divine purpose in the history of Israel. None but prophets could write such books as these; none but those who have living fellowship with the Holy Spirit can read them with fullest appreciation. The authors or compilers wrote not with the main purpose of preserving well-known facts from oblivion, nor to furnish an exhaustive record of their times and people, but to show how God interposes in the affairs of men. The Hebrew prophet saw God in history, and the great purpose of his mission and ministry was to point out this all-important truth, and to impress its significant lessons upon the people of his generation.

The proof of their inspiration.

The anonymous character of these Earlier Prophets is a matter to be noticed. The writers did not seek to immortalize their names in authorship, nor do they appear to have thought that their readers in after times would be interested to know who they were. It was not until the later times of a degenerate Judaism, when there was utter lack of sound critical judgment among

Their anonymous character.

the scribes and rabbis, that men presumed by means of guesswork and conjecture to designate the authors of the canonical books. What value we may set upon their literary judgment may be inferred from the following well-known passage in the Babylonian Talmud. In answer to the question, Who wrote the books of Scripture? it is said:

> Moses wrote his own book and the section concerning Balaam and Job. Joshua wrote his own book and eight verses of the Law. Samuel wrote his own book and Judges and Ruth. David wrote the Book of Psalms, at the direction of ten elders. . . . Jeremiah wrote his own book and the Book of Kings and Lamentations. Hezekiah and his college wrote Isaiah, Proverbs, Song of Songs, and Koheleth. The men of the great synagogue wrote Ezekiel, the Twelve, Daniel, and Esther. Ezra wrote his own book and the genealogies of the Book of Chronicles as far as himself.

What authority can such a strange medley of conjectures have with an intelligent student of the Bible? Jeremiah may indeed have written the Book of Kings as well as his own book, but how could Samuel have written the book that bears his name when the larger part of it concerns events which occurred after his death? The passage is of no more value in determining the authorship of Joshua than of Job. If "Hezekiah and his college wrote Isaiah," we may with as good reason say that Ezra and his college wrote the Law and the Earlier Prophets. But we should ask nobody to believe it as an article of faith.

We are not to suppose that the writers of these books, whoever they were, attempted to compose an original history by a scientific analysis of their sources of information, a sifting of authorities, and a reconstruction of materials according

Compiled from older documents.

to certain modern standards of historical composition. The books themselves bear abundant internal evidence of having been compiled out of documents of an older date. Ancient songs, like that of Deborah, public events reported only by oral tradition, and narratives of wars and adventures of great chieftains were combined in such order and to such extent as suited the writer's purpose. Ancient documents were transferred entire, or with slight modification, to the new composition.

Embellishment of older narratives.

It was also a well-known habit of ancient writers to embellish their narratives by speeches of the different actors in the scenes described. A comparison of the correspondence between Solomon and Hiram, king of Tyre, as reported in 1 Kings v; 2 Chron. ii, and Josephus (*Antiquities*, viii, 2, 6), will show what freedom these several historians exercised in composing the addresses which they attribute to others. Sometimes the writer acknowledges his sources, and tells his reader where additional information was to be found, as in 1 Kings xi, 41; xiv, 19, 29; xv, 7, 31. In other cases he simply appropriated from older writers what served his purpose, occasionally modifying or revising it in order to secure unity of narrative.

Compilation of Joshua.

The Book of Joshua appears to have been compiled largely out of the same sources of information which are traceable in the Pentateuch. It connects closely with Deuteronomy, and continues its narrative portions so as to describe the conquest and occupation of Canaan. Its obvious pur-

pose is so vitally associated with that of the preceding books that many critics treat them all together under the title of the Hexateuch. The sixfold volume is thus seen to contain a magnificent outline of the divine call and organization of the chosen nation, and their triumphant settlement in the land promised to their first great father, Abraham. Viewed in this broad outline as a whole, the Hexateuch, with its wonderful contents and variety of matter, is a grand national epic, in comparison with which the famous Shah Nameh of the Persian poet Firdausi seems almost puerile.

The Book of Judges consists of three distinguishable parts—an introduction, i, 1-ii, 5, or perhaps a double introduction, i, 1-ii, 5, and ii, 6-iii, 6; a history of twelve judges, iii, 7-xvi, 31; and a double appendix, xvii-xxi (=xvii-xviii and xix-xxi). Some of its material, as the Song of Deborah (chap. v), is believed to belong to the very oldest monuments of Hebrew literature extant. Learned criticism may legitimately busy itself in scientific study of the various sources out of which the present book was made. Such studies should not disparage, but rather enhance, the real value of the work. The main purpose of the author was obviously of a religious and didactic character, and he belonged to the same school of prophets to whom we are indebted for the compilation of Deuteronomy and Joshua. The most casual reader cannot fail to notice the formal repetitions of statement which begin and conclude the story of the achievements of each great

Judges.

The purpose of Judges.

judge. "The children of Israel did evil in the sight of Jehovah. . . . Therefore the anger of Jehovah was kindled against Israel, and he sold them into the hand of— . . . And when the children of Israel cried unto Jehovah, Jehovah raised up a saviour, who delivered them. . . . And the land had rest forty years" (iii, 7-11; so in iii, 12, 15, 30, and frequently). The positiveness with which the relations between Jehovah and Israel are affirmed is the peculiar characteristic of each successive picture set before the reader's eye. It has been well observed that "this regular movement of apostasy, subjugation, penitence, and deliverance is hardly strict history. It is rather the religious philosophy of the history. It is a summary of the historical movements written under the idea that Jehovah presided in the history of Israel, and to bring it down to our level we must read second causes into the movements and the operations of the people's mind."[1] To which we may also appropriately add the following words of Stanley: "Other portions of Scripture may be more profitable for doctrine, for correction, for reproof, for instruction in righteousness; but for merely human interest, for the lively touches of ancient manners, for the succession of romantic incidents, for the consciousness that we are living face to face with the persons described, for the tragical pathos of events and characters, there is nothing like the history of the judges from Othniel to Eli. No portion of the Hebrew Scriptures brings us so near to the times described. It

[1] Prof. A. B. Davidson, in the *Expositor* of 1887, pp. 48, 49.

would seem, if one may venture to say so, as if the Book of Judges had been left in the sacred books with the express view of enforcing upon us the necessity (which we are sometimes anxious to evade) of recognizing the human, national, let us even add barbarian, element which plays its part in the sacred history."[1]

The Book of Samuel[2] connects the period of the judges with that of the kings, and brings the history down to the complete establishment of the Hebrew monarchy under David. **Book of Samuel.**

Like the preceding books, it contains abundant evidence of having been compiled out of preexisting documents. In 1 Sam. x, 25, it is said that Samuel himself wrote a book descriptive of "the manner of the kingdom." The mention in 1 Chron. xxix, 29, of the words or histories of Samuel and Nathan and Gad suggests the existence of many monographs, and the poetical compositions which our author has inserted in his book (namely, Hannah's Song, 1 Sam. ii, 1-10; David's Elegy, 2 Sam. i, 19-27; and the psalms in 2 Sam. xxii and xxiii) show what a variety and extent of national literature were at his command. Ewald observes that "when the Books of Samuel were written the majestic forms of Samuel and David were not very far removed from the nation's memory, but only just raised above the misappreciation

[1] *Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church*, First Series, pp. 315, 316. New York, 1869.

[2] The division into two books was made by the Greek translators (Septuagint), adopted thence in the Latin Vulgate and other versions, and in the sixteenth century introduced into printed copies of the Hebrew Bible. In Hebrew manuscripts both Samuel and Kings are each one book. In the Septuagint they are resolved into the first, second, third, and fourth books of Kings.

of their own time. Hence no portion of the Old Testament produces comparatively so satisfactory an effect on the historical inquirer as this does; for here we see the whole reality and truth of a great human scene peep out behind tradition, and discern historical greatness surrounded by all the fetters and limitations of its temporal conditions."[1]

Kings and its contents.

The Book of Kings continues the history of Israel from the death of David down to the period of the Babylonian exile. It naturally falls into three sections: (1) the history of Solomon, 1 Kings i-xi; (2) conjoint history of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, 1 Kings xii-2 Kings xvii; (3) history of the decline and fall of the kingdom of Judah, 2 Kings xviii-xxv. The author's habit of referring to the authorities from which he derived his information is conspicuous throughout (for example, 1 Kings xi, 41; xiv, 19, 29, etc.), and his formulas for introducing and concluding the account of each king are as stereotyped as the corresponding fact already noticed in the Book of Judges. What mainly distinguishes these annals of the kings from the more ancient chronicles to which they so often refer is doubtless their religious character and purpose. The supposition that Jeremiah was the author has seemed probable because of the close agreement between 2 Kings xxv and Jer. lii; but whoever the author, he was manifestly gifted with the spirit and power of Jeremiah. He belonged to the prophetic order, and viewed the history of Israel

[1] *History of the Israelitish People.*

as an object lesson of the manner in which God is immanent in the affairs of men and nations, punishing sin and rewarding righteousness. The didactic passage in 2 Kings xvii, 7-27, enforces the prophetic conception of Israel's sins and downfall, and the closing paragraph of the book (2 Kings xxv, 27-30), in recording the release and elevation of Jehoiachin, is suggestive of a ray of light breaking in upon the future prospects of the Jewish people, and assuring them that the Most High rules in the kingdom of men.

2. THE CHARACTERS.

The first great character to arrest attention in this series of prophetico-historical books is Joshua the conqueror. In the first verse of the book which bears his name he is called the "minister of Moses," whereas Moses himself is called the "servant of Jehovah." The word "minister" connotates a higher and more honorable office than "servant;" but it is a greater glory to be a trusted servant of God than to be the prime minister of any earthly sovereign. At the close of the book (xxiv, 29), however, Joshua also is called the servant of Jehovah, and the entire book is a monument of the lofty place he holds in the history of Israel. He was neither prophet nor priest, but he was nevertheless directly called and appointed by Jehovah to lead his people into the promised land. He accordingly stands forth in the prophetic record as a type of the greatest heroes, raised up at a crucial period to do the will of God. His work was

Joshua.

different from that of Moses, but the same divine Providence was back of it, voiced in those words which still ring through the centuries as the inspiration of every devout servant of God: "There shall not any man be able to stand before thee all the days of thy life: as I was with Moses, so I will be with thee: I will not fail thee, nor forsake thee. Be strong and of a good courage: for thou shalt cause this people to inherit the land which I sware unto their fathers to give them" (Josh. i, 5, 6). The contents of the Book of Joshua, with its thrilling pictures of crossing the Jordan, overthrowing the heathen whose iniquity was full (comp. Gen. xv, 16), possessing and allotting the land of promise, and the farewell addresses and death of the glorious commander, all group themselves around the towering personality of Joshua, and show how God was glorified through him.

Gideon.

As the most conspicuous characters in the Book of Judges we may take the four named in the Epistle to the Hebrews (xi, 32)—Gideon, Barak, Samson, and Jephthah. Each of these names suggests a distinctive type of character, and each reveals in the biblical record an ideal of God's methods with mankind. Gideon, threshing wheat by the wine press, hearing Jehovah speak in visions and dreams, and testing him by the sign of the fleece, selecting his choice three hundred, and confounding the enemy by the blast of trumpets, the breaking of pitchers, and the battle cry of "The sword of Jehovah and of Gideon"—these and his other deeds of wisdom present the pic-

ture of gentleness, simplicity, faith, heroism, and daring united in one man, and bringing forth their various fruits in a time of peculiar oppression and trial. The name of Barak is inseparably associated with that of Deborah the prophetess, whose immortal song declares that Jehovah came down among the heroes, and made the stars from their courses fight with Sisera; while Barak led the captives away, and saw the enemies of Jehovah perish. Barak is the type of not a few distinguished names in history who have achieved honor through the promptings of a less active but more powerful spirit than their own. Samson is a very different type of character, the most singular and eccentric to be found in the Old Testament. He was rough and savage toward his enemies, yet cool and shrewd about it all; never showing sudden outbursts of fiery passion, but perpetrating some of his fiercest cruelties as if with a smile upon his face. The key to the divine side of his life is to be seen in his consecration as a Nazarite (xiii, 5). From the theocratic point of view this exalted him into a kind of sacred character as well as a great hero. But if Samson is the most eccentric character of the Bible, Jephthah is the lower and more abandoned. He was the son of a harlot, and, early driven out of his inheritance by his father's lawful children, he fled to the desert and gathered vain men about him. But he became Jehovah's hero by his triumph over the Ammonites. He is remembered, however, chiefly by reason of the vow he made to Jehovah,

Barak.

Samson.

Jephthah.

that in the event of the victory he would offer as a burnt offering whoever first came forth from his house to meet him on his return. The vow was an act at once of mighty faith and fearful ignorance. We may believe that such a man as Jephthah supposed a human sacrifice to be the noblest possible offering to God. Such was, no doubt, the feeling of the king of Moab in the act described in 2 Kings iii, 27.

All these characters, strange as they may appear to some as standing in the Scriptures, have each a value in showing how God employs all manner of persons to subserve his purposes. "We cannot pretend to say," says Stanley, "that Samson and Jephthah, hardly that Gideon or Barak, are characters which we should have selected as devout men, as servants of God. We should, at least if we had met them in another history, have regarded them as wild freebooters, as stern chieftains, at best as high-minded patriots. They are bursting with passion; they are stained by revenge; they are alternately lax and superstitious. Their virtues are of the rough kind, which make them subjects of personal or poetic interest rather than of sober edification; their words are remarkable, not so much for devotion or wisdom as for a burning enthusiasm, like the Song of Deborah; for a chivalrous frankness, as in the acts of Phinehas and of Jephthah; for a ready presence of mind, as in the movements of Gideon; for a primitive and racy humor, as in the repartees of Samson. Yet these characters are without hesitation ranked among the lights of the chosen people; the world's heroes are fearlessly

enrolled among God's heroes; the men in whom we should be inclined to recognize only the strong arm which defends us, and the rough wit which amuses us, are described as 'raised up of God.' No modern theory of inspiration checks the sacred writers in speaking of the Spirit of the Lord as clothing Gideon as with a mantle for his enterprise, as descending upon Othniel and Jephthah for their wars, as striking the soul of Samson as a bell or drum, or as rushing upon him with irresistible force for his heroic deeds. In a lower degree, doubtless, and mingled with many infirmities, the wild chiefs of this stormy epoch, with their Phœnician titles, their Bedouin lives, and their muscular religion, partook of the same Spirit which inspired Moses and Joshua before them, and David and Isaiah after them." [1]

The three most notable regal characters depicted in the Books of Samuel and Kings are Saul, David, and Solomon. The first king of Israel appears as a man of deep emotions, capable of sudden inspirations for good, but no less the victim of evil passions which in the end obtained the mastery of him. Chapters xiii-xv of First Samuel picture before us the three great errors of Saul's reign, as if intended for a sort of tragic trilogy. The first was his disobedience at Gilgal, the second his rash vow which associates him with the passionate and hasty Jephthah, and the third was his disobedience in failing to execute the divine judgment on the Amalekites, whereupon the prophet Samuel declared to him:

Saul.

[1] *Lectures on the Jewish Church*, First Series, pp. 339, 340.

> Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice,
> And to hearken than the fat of rams.
> For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft,
> And stubbornness is as idolatry and teraphim.
> Because thou hast rejected the word of Jehovah,
> He hath also rejected thee from being king.

These three mistakes were the moral crises of Saul's life, and from them resulted all his subsequent woes. The theocratic view, not only of Saul's reign, but of monarchy in Israel in general, is voiced in Hosea's words (xiii, 11):

> I have given thee a king in mine anger,
> And have taken him away in my wrath.

But though Saul's reign was comparatively a failure, his career is sketched with a kind of plaintive tenderness. Not only did Samuel mourn for him, but the writer of the Books of Samuel seems to have caught the sad, tender feeling of sympathy with his misfortunes, and has breathed it into his narrative. In the same spirit David poured out his soul in the touching elegy on the fall of Saul and Jonathan.

We find a very different sort of man in the son of Jesse. No character in Old Testament history is so many-sided, no genius so versatile, as that of David—the red-haired shepherd boy, the passionate lover and romantic friend, the chivalrous chieftain, the mighty warrior, the anointed king, the sweet psalmist, and the tender father. David rather than Saul was the real founder of the Hebrew monarchy. His wise statesmanship early secured "the stronghold of Zion" for a national capital, and took

David.

effective measures to unify and centralize the national power. And thus enthroned on Zion, the great king, the "star out of Jacob," the "light of Israel," the man after God's own heart, became the ideal and type of the Messiah. But the stern veracity of the prophetic writer does not conceal the dark sides of David's life. He shows us that with all his greatness and glory there were to be charged against him dissimulation, falsehood, polygamy, adultery, and even blood-guiltiness. Many a sneering unbeliever has satirically asked, "Is this the manner of a man after God's own heart?" Such scoffers seem to look at nothing else in David. They never consider the profound spiritual struggles of "a broken and contrite heart" which followed the sins. Not his sins, which, indeed, were many, but his persistent purpose to be true to the cause of Jehovah and his people, made him the man after God's heart. As compared with this his faults were rather sudden and erratic, occasioned by extraordinary temptations. His zeal and loyalty to Jehovah were steadfast, and such was his strength of character, and the deep humility with which he sought restoration from his fall, that his greatest sins were speedily overlooked by the people, and his name has ever been reverenced as greatest among the kings of Israel.

Solomon.

Solomon, the son of David, was not behind his father in many elements of greatness, but he was also conspicuously diverse. He is set before us as Jehovah's darling, a seeker after wisdom and choosing her above all other things, a saga-

cious judge, a powerful and glorious ruler, surpassing in many ways the kings of the nations round about him; his navies traversing many seas, while kings and princes came from afar to lay their gifts at his feet. But in his later years he became despotic, a polygamist, and an idolater. Yet in his reign the Hebrew monarchy attained the highest point of its worldly splendor, the memory of which is still witnessed by many an oriental legend. But as viewed from the theocratic standpoint Solomon's reign was a lamentable failure. It corresponds somewhat with the failure of Saul. Saul's misfortunes, however, were largely owing to his incapacity and moral obliquity. He was unequal to the task of successfully establishing a monarchy over a nation that had been ruled in other forms. With Solomon there was no want of ability or wisdom. But his grievous sins, from which he did not recover like his father David, cloud the horizon of his latter days. There he stands in the historical setting of the Book of Kings as one with whom "Jehovah was angry." One part of his history appears in strangest contrast with the other—the grandest and perhaps the saddest personage among the kings of Israel.

Period of Samuel and Kings.

The period covered by the Books of Samuel and Kings was that during which many of the greatest prophets flourished. It seems to have been the chief mission of the Hebrew prophets to counteract the worldly and idolatrous tendencies of their times. The relations of Samuel and Saul furnish a typical illustration. The man of God

stands over against king and people, who imagine that Jehovah has more delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices than in a life of obedience to the moral law (comp. 1 Sam. xv, 22; Isa. i, 11-17; Mic. vi, 6-8). Samuel appears in the sacred history as the last judge in Israel and the first great prophet of the organized nation. He fills the ideal of the commissioned and authoritative messenger of God, a revealer of the divine will, bold to rebuke the wickedness of kings and peoples and to declare the judgments that would surely follow personal and national sins. He occupies the place of a spiritual watchman, set over the people to make known the eternal truths of the divine government and apply them to the persons and events of his age. Samuel by reason of his office and work as a prophet stands at the beginning of this order of teachers in Israel (comp. Acts iii, 24). The first allusion to bands or schools of the prophets occurs in connection with his ministry (1 Sam. x, 5; xix, 20). These associations of devout men were probably powerful agencies for maintaining the higher knowledge and more spiritual worship of Jehovah among the people. They probably originated in the days of Samuel, who, pictured before us in these books as the holy child, the saintly judge, and especially the venerable prophet, stands forth as one of the monumental characters on which no blemish appears, and whose memory Jew and Christian alike delight to honor. As seer and prophet he has no superior in the history of ancient Israel.

Nathan and Gad were prophets who had most in-

timate relations with David, but neither of them attained such eminence as Samuel. Many other prophets arose during this period of whom we know but little. Ahijah the Shilonite was famous for his word to Jeroboam (1 Kings xi, 29-39). Jehu and Micaiah and others are mentioned in connection with similar oracles, and prophets of Jehovah were so numerous in the days of Ahab that they were numbered by fifties (1 Kings xviii, 4). The "sons of the prophets," that is, disciples of such men as Samuel and Elisha, would seem to have been a great multitude (comp. 2 Kings ii, 3, 7, 15; iv, 1).

Minor prophets of the period.

But there is one prophet of the time of Ahab and Jezebel whose name and work are altogether exceptional. His sudden appearance in the narrative of the kings has been spoken of as lightning falling from the clouds, or a firebrand hurled by the hand of Jehovah. It is as surprising, says one, "as if he had dropped out of that cloudy chariot which, after his work was done on earth, conveyed him back to heaven." In the weird grandeur of his desert life, in the fiery spirit of his words and the power of his public acts, he stands apart from all others in that ancient time, and seems to bestride the land of Israel like a colossus. His disciple and successor, Elisha, "who poured water on the hands of Elijah" (2 Kings iii, 11), is so associated with him that we can now scarcely separate the two. And yet the characters of Elijah and Elisha stand out in remarkable contrast. The one was rough and almost ter-

Elijah.

Elisha.

rible in his acts of power; the other more approachable and dwelling more continuously among the sons of the prophets, as if he were really one of them. But after the departure of the great master these sons of the prophets said, "The spirit of Elijah doth rest upon Elisha." It is interesting to compare Elijah's abode with the widow of Zarephath (1 Kings xvii) and that of Elisha with the Shunammite wife (2 Kings iv). But the contrast between the wonderful translation of Elijah by a whirlwind into heaven and the death and burial of Elisha and the subsequent miracle of his bones (2 Kings xiii, 14-21) is worthy of note. Dr. Adam Clarke observes that "this is the first and last account of a true miracle performed by a dead man's bones." Stanley says that "Elisha's works stand alone in the Bible in their likeness to the acts of mediæval saints. There alone, in the sacred history, the gulf between biblical and ecclesiastical miracles almost disappears."

Comparison of the two.

The question whether this section of the Book of Kings is or is not a collection of legendary traditions is receiving an affirmative answer from a continually increasing number of biblical scholars. The rejection of them as real history arises not from disbelief in the supernatural, but from other considerations. One may eliminate the narratives of Elijah and Elisha and combine them in a separate section by themselves so as to form what appears to have been one of the sources used by the writer

Story of these prophets inserted in the Kings.

of Kings.[1] It was a period of nearly three hundred years between the time of these prophets and the composition of the Book of Kings. This was ample space for many embellished accounts of extraordinary prophets to have become current among the people, and to have been written out as a monograph for popular edification. The compiler of Kings would naturally have incorporated such a document with no modifications except such as might be incidental to the distribution of its material to fit the course of his narrative. Such an hypothesis of the origin and character of a distinguishable portion of the Book of Kings is without serious objection except from those who are governed by the *a priori* assumption that any incorporation of narratives not truly authentic is inconsistent with the inspiration and purpose of the Holy Scriptures. Those who are not convinced of the truthfulness of that assumption may be able to see that the theocratic ideals of the Old Testament prophets were more forcibly inculcated by means of such embellished pictures of the divine in human history than would have been possible by strict adherence to bare details of fact. Whether God has inspired or can inspire holy men to set forth doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness by means of ideally embellished history, as well as by types,

[1] 1 Kings xvii-xix, xxi; 2 Kings i, ii, iii, 4-27; iv-viii, 15; ix, 1-10; and xiii, 14-21, might be eliminated from the Book of Kings, and yet the substance of the history would not be destroyed. The secular or political course of events moves on independent of these Elijah and Elisha portions; but a prophetic or theocratic writer would study to embellish his own narrative with all that would give it charm, and tend to enhance the idea of God in history.

symbols, metaphors, allegories, and parables, is a question which cannot be settled by the voice of any modern preacher or by the votes of councils. On this question differing opinions may be entertained, and unanimity may never be secured. There is no warrant in any saying of Christ or his apostles for making such a question an article of faith. In the sacred books there stand scores of characters like Joshua, and Gideon, and Jephthah, and Samuel, and Elijah; and he who searches the Scriptures in the true spirit will not fail to learn from them the deepest lessons of righteousness, whatever his opinion as to the authenticity of the various narratives.

Opinion as to these books not an article of faith.

3. THE LESSONS.

We are to keep before our minds, in the study of the Scriptures, that the great purpose of these sacred books is to reveal and inculcate lessons of righteousness. Such lessons include matters pertaining to doctrines of God and man, admonition, remonstrance, warning, rebuke, suggestion, and positive precept. But reason and a critical judgment are important in all our study, in order to keep us from the extravagances into which many have fallen. Allegorical and mystical interpretation, and the habit of looking for occult meaning and a double or threefold sense in some of the plainest narratives of the Bible, have been the fruitful source of mischievous vagaries in exposition. The notion that every word of Holy Scripture is freighted with "mountains of sense,"

Purpose of the books.

as some of the rabbis were wont to say, should be cast aside as a silly figment of superstition. As the several parts of a great picture have no special or separate significance when taken by themselves, but in combination with each other, and as serving to enhance the grand total impression of the picture as designed by the artist, so many of the elements which combine to make up the Bible have no particular or exceptional value when divorced from their organic relations to the whole. Such a list of names as that recorded in Num. i, 5-15, or that of 2 Sam. xxiii, 24-39, or those of most of the biblical genealogies, have no practical value or profit in themselves. It is only when viewed as incidental parts of a larger scripture that they take on a moral value, and admonish us that all the onward movements of human history must have a realistic basis in individual life and action as well as in family and civil relations. The list of the kings smitten by Joshua (Josh. xii, 9-24) may have some measure of archæological interest and value, but its religious purpose in the book is only incidental as helping to form the graphic picture of Israel's conquest of the land of promise.

In the Book of Judges no less than in that of Joshua we are to learn the lessons of divine providence in the historical development of mankind. In the origin and growth of the Israelitish nation we behold an outline of the history of every nation. But no nation exhibits such interposition of God "to redeem unto himself a people, and to make him a name" (2 Sam. vii, 23) as does Israel. In the

The hand of God in history.

prophetic outline of this nation's history we may as in no other learn how all the nations have sometimes had in a general way their clan or colony beginnings, their territorial settlements, their rude and lawless ages, and ultimate attainment of authoritative nationality. In the early history of most nations we find a tendency to segregation; local and clannish feelings retard the spread of nobler sentiments, and hinder the progress of civilization. These lessons we may learn to give a wider application, and from them preach to the world doctrines of the broadest sociology and political economy. We are not to suppose that God's hand interposed in the history of the Hebrews, but not in other nations. Greece and Rome had, and England and the United States have, a divine side in their history and purpose as truly as had Israel. In every civilized state or nation "the powers that be are ordained of God," and all the great peoples, that have attained to national self-consciousness and responsibility, are God's mighty agents in the government of the world.

Isolation and its perils.

In the transition from the rule of the judges to the establishment of monarchy we observe that political revolutions and changes in the form of government may bear the impress of a divine sanction. The vain ambitions, mistaken assumptions, and formal complaints among the people may grieve a prophet like Samuel (1 Sam. viii, 6), and be an offense in the sight of God; but Jehovah was as truly the Sovereign of the Hebrew people after the

Divine sanction for revolutions.

establishment of monarchy as he was before. He is governor among all the nations, and he has revealed among them all those fundamental principles and laws without which no organized State can maintain its moral order. Laws are written on the human heart which diverse civilizations will develop into varying forms of national discipline, and we learn from the story of the first king of Israel that to nations themselves is properly left, according to the counsel of God, the responsibility of choosing the form of government by which they will be ruled.

The prayer test.

The lessons involved in all the great events which are grouped, in these Earlier Prophets, about the names of Saul, and David, and Solomon, and the later kings of Israel and Judah, are manifold. They have furnished texts and topics for thousands of sermons, and will be profitable for like purposes in all time to come. We conclude this chapter with one of the lessons to be learned from the story of Elijah. It is written in 1 Kings xviii, 17-xix, 18, and is the record of a monumental prayer test for all men to study. It is strange that Christian people and biblical students in general have been so slow to learn the real lesson of the prayer test on Mount Carmel. The picture of Elijah confronted by hundreds of the prophets of Baal, whom he had challenged to test by prayer and sacrifice the God who could answer by fire from heaven, is most impressively graphic. The place of the contest was most commanding and inspiring, for from the top of Carmel one gets his finest view of the length

and breadth of the land of Israel. The scene was dignified by the presence of the king and his princes, and the hundreds of Jezebel's prophets and the thousands of the children of Israel crowded about and filled the open places of the mountain.

The prophets of Baal began the contest, prepared their offering, and called on their god from morning until noontide; but there came no answer. Then Elijah added to their confusion by his sarcastic words: "Cry out a little louder! Your deity perhaps is talking with some one else and fails to hear you! May be he is off on a journey, or, peradventure, he has gone to sleep!" But they only became more violent in manner, and cut themselves with knives till the blood gushed out upon them; and yet no voice or answer from on high. Then came Elijah's turn. He builded his altar, and dug a trench about it, and placed his victim on the wood piled over the altar, and, to make the miracle the more astounding, he poured over the whole four barrels of water, and repeated the drenching a second and a third time, until the water flooded wood, and stones, and trench. And then Elijah prayed to the God of Israel, "and the fire of Jehovah fell and consumed the burnt offering, and the wood, and the stones, and the dust, and licked up the water that was in the trench."

It would be difficult to conceive or portray a prayer test more signal and a triumph more overwhelming than that. The witnessing multitude fell prostrate, and cried as with one voice, "Jehovah is the God!" And in the wild excite-

Completeness of the test.

ment of the hour they seized the dejected prophets of Baal, and slaughtered them by the river Kishon. But how many of those who read this glowing story perceive its monumental illustration of the worthlessness of such signs and wonders as means of changing the hearts of men? What did that stupendous miracle effect? It resulted in no apparent diminution of the Baal worship. There is not a shred of evidence that one individual in all Israel was permanently converted to Jehovah by all that sublime display of power. But whatever effect it may have had in the soul of Ahab it proved utterly incompetent to change the mind of Jezebel. When she heard of the death of her prophets she sent this word to Elijah: "So let the gods do to me, and more also, if I make not thy life as the life of one of them by to-morrow about this time." And, behold! that prophet of fire, so omnipotent but yesterday, ran away crying like a whipped child, and even wishing that he might die.

Results of it.

But he received the counterpart and corrective of his failure with Jezebel and her prophets in the supplementary lesson which God gave him in Mount Horeb. We read it in 1 Kings xix, 4-18. He fled for his life from Jezebel, and exhibited his own error and self-conceit in saying: "I have been very jealous for Jehovah, the God of hosts; for the children of Israel have forsaken thy covenant, thrown down thine altars, and slain thy prophets with the sword: and I, even I only, am left; and they seek my life, to take it away." Then the God of Abraham

The reproof to Elijah.

and of Israel gave the discouraged and despairing prophet a suggestive revelation. He was commanded to go forth and stand before Jehovah on the mount, and then it is said: "Behold, Jehovah passed by, and a great and strong wind rent the mountains, and brake in pieces the rocks before Jehovah; but Jehovah was not in the wind: and after the wind an earthquake; but Jehovah was not in the earthquake: and after the earthquake a fire; but Jehovah was not in the fire: and after the fire a still small voice."

The obvious lesson of this apocalypse is that there are mightier influences at work in human history than external displays of physical power. Elijah was admonished that, so far from his being the only true worshiper of God alive, there were seven thousand in Israel who had not bowed unto Baal. They were doubtless like himself hidden in caves and dens of the earth; but they were divinely nourished by the word of God, and formed a chosen remnant from whom a purer and noble Israel should some day come. Displays of power in the world of sense, like those on Carmel, may command a temporary and mechanical submission, but are of little value as compared with the deep still voice of moral and intellectual conviction. A thinking spirit cannot be coerced into belief. The mighty wind and earthquake and fire of physical force may easily break rocks into pieces, but cannot change one tender human heart. The holy life and importunate prayers of the faithful seven thousand in Israel are of more avail than all the miracles of Elijah and Elisha.

What a profound spiritual lesson is this to be set in the midst of the Old Testament! And yet how slow men are, even in this day of fuller Christian revelation, to profit by this lesson! Blind even to the teachings of Jesus, they keep on crying, "Show us a sign, and we will believe." We are tempted at times to think that some would be willing to crucify the Son of God afresh every day if only they could see him come down from the cross and confound a scoffing crowd. They seem to elevate one prayer test above all the lessons of the Sermon on the Mount. They talk and act as if there were immeasurably greater value in one successful "faith cure," that has made a local and temporary sensation, than in the whole record of a saintly life that has made no greater show in the world than that of visiting the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and persuading a hundred sinners to cease doing evil and to love and serve the living God. All such errorists need to learn Elijah's lesson of the still small voice.

CHAPTER III.

BOOKS OF PROPHETIC ORACLES.

What mean those mighty voices of the past,
  Those oracles that shook the hearts of kings,
  And thrilled and quivered like the burning wings
Of seraphs, as with power they did forecast
The future, uttering truths that ever last
  To train the heart of man in holy things?
Hosea, Amos, Micah, still ye speak
  Divinest mysteries of heavenly thought
For all who with a prayerful spirit seek
  To know the lessons which Jehovah taught.
O that mankind were more intent to know
  The words of prophecy proclaimed of old,—
  Treasures of truth and wisdom manifold,
Irradiant with an everlasting glow!

CHAPTER III.

BOOKS OF PROPHETIC ORACLES.

EASILY distinguishable from books of prophetic history, like those noticed in the previous chapter, are those books of prophecy which preserve for us the words of the great Hebrew seers. There were many great prophets in Israel who left no written oracles to be read by subsequent generations. They delivered their message to the men of their time, and no record was made of it, unless, as in the case of Ahijah the Shilonite (1 Kings xi, 29f.), or of Jehu, the son of Hanani (xvi, 7), some historical writer made some incidental mention of the fact. It appears also from 1 Chron. xxix, 29, that Nathan the prophet and Gad the seer wrote certain books concerning the acts of David which are no longer extant, and some prophetic oracles once written may have been lost.

Unwritten prophecies.

The Books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve Minor Prophets constitute a most important portion of the Old Testament. The Book of Daniel is usually associated with these prophets, although in the Jewish canon it is placed among the Hagiographa. The limits of our present work will not permit a notice of all these books in detail, nor does the purpose of this little volume require so comprehensive a survey of this literature. We select for brief discussion those books

which best represent the distinctive types of prophecy, and classify them accordingly. This method of procedure will enable us not only to form a correct idea of the nature of the prophetic office and work in Israel, but also to appreciate the breadth and variety of this prophetic literature. We shall first take up the Books of Amos, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, and devote the present chapter to a consideration of their contents and chief lessons.

AMOS.

The times of Amos.

The prophecy of Amos is assigned to the latter part of the reign of Jeroboam, the son of Joash, king of Israel, after Uzziah became king of Judah (chap. i, 1; comp. 2 Kings xv, 1). This was at the most flourishing period of the history of the northern kingdom of Israel. It was Jeroboam who recovered all that outlying region on the borders of the north, east, and south, which had been wrested from Israel by various heathen powers during the reigns of his predecessors. And this great worldly prosperity begat luxury and its attendant vices in all the chief cities of the kingdom, and led to the oppression of the poor, the corruption of morals, and general disregard of religious truth and obligation. Religious life and worship had sunk to the merest formalism, and its show of sacrifices and tithes at Bethel, and Gilgal, and Dan, and Beersheba, as seen from what the prophet says in chap. iv, 4; v, 5; viii, 14, was a form of transgression rather than of true obedience.

The Book of Amos is a model of Old Testament

prophetic writing. The author was not a disciple of the schools of the prophets, but a herdsman of Tekoa, and one that was trained to be a dresser of fruit trees (vii, 14). His composition, however, shows him to have been a man of no mean culture, and his language and style are worthy of comparison with the most admired examples of Hebrew writing. Though familiar with the scenery of rustic life, he had looked upon the palaces of the great and could speak advisedly of their costly ivory, and their couches of Damascus silk (iii, 12, 15). He knows the history of the contiguous nations, and of Hamath the great and Calneh (vi, 2). The character of the Cushites and the migrations of the Philistines and the Syrians are as well known to him as the exodus of Israel from Egypt (ix, 7). He alludes like a man of broad knowledge to the inundations of the Nile (viii, 8; ix, 5), and to the constellations of the Pleiades and Orion (v, 8). The imagery he employs is varied and striking. Being a herdsman and a gatherer of fruits, he very naturally speaks of cows of Bashan (iv, 1), a shepherd rescuing portions from the lion's mouth (iii, 12), a cart pressed down with sheaves (ii, 13), the growth of the rowen (vii, 1), the ripened fruit (viii, 1), the sifted grain (ix, 9), and vineyards and gardens (ix, 14). He speaks of the horse and his rider, the archer and the fleet fugitive (ii, 15), the bird that has fallen in the snare (iii, 5), the deadly work of the lion, the bear, and the serpent (v, 19). His thought ranges from the top of Carmel to the bottom of the sea,

The book and its style.

and from the high heavens to the depths of Sheol (ix, 2, 3). He sees in the midday eclipse of the sun a symbol of fearful judgment (viii, 9), and his vivid imagination portrays most impressively the revelry of impious feasts (v, 23; vi, 5, 6), and the woes of famine and pestilence and aggravated mortality (vi, 9, 10). The picture presented in this last-named passage may be taken as a specimen of the power of this prophet to portray a scene of horror:

When one's friend and burner takes him up,
To carry forth the bones out of the house,
And says to the one in the innermost parts of the house,
Is there any yet with thee? and he says, No;
Then he says, Hush!—For one may not make mention of the name of Jehovah.

Our thought is here turned to the death of ten men in one dwelling. The ninth is supposed to have just died, and his friend or near kinsman, whose duty it is to attend to the rites of burial, comes and takes up his bones —his body wasted to a bare skeleton—to carry them out for decent funereal disposition, and to make for him some sort of a burning (comp. 2 Chron. xxi, 19). He calls to the last and only survivor of the ten, who is back in the most retired part of the house, and asks him if there is any other besides himself yet remaining with him, and gets the mournful ghostly whisper, *No.* Thereupon the friend says, *Hush!* Keep silent; for one may well shrink even from mention of the name of Jehovah, who has made himself so terrible in this judgment of fatal pestilence.

The opening words of the prophecy (chap. i, 2) may be here cited as an additional example of the power of Amos as a writer:

> Jehovah shall out of Zion roar,
> And from Jerusalem give forth his voice;
> And then shall the dwellings of the shepherds mourn,
> And the head of Carmel wither away.

To the rapt soul of the prophet the voice of Jehovah is heard in the thunder, but it is also thought of as a lion's roaring. Without such imagery as a vehicle of thought and illustration the oracles of the Hebrew prophets would be shorn of much of their moving power.

Places, message, and composition.

According to chapter vii, 15, Jehovah took this prophet from his humble work in Tekoa, and sent him northward to utter his word at the royal sanctuary at Beth-el. We are reminded in this statement of the similar journey and mission of the unnamed prophet whose sad story is recorded in 1 Kings xiii. Tekoa, the home of Amos, was a city set upon a hill a few miles south of Bethlehem. The view from its broad summit is extensive and charming, and amid those beautiful scenes our prophet must have found much to cultivate his imagination and his heart. The journey thence to Beth-el covered a distance of about twenty-four miles. His book begins with a series of oracles against six neighboring nations, followed by one against Judah; but the main burden of his words is "what he saw concerning Israel." He speaks of receiving his revelation "two years before the earthquake" (i, 1; comp. Zech. xiv, 5). It is scarcely sup-

posable that the prophet himself would have made such a reference to an earthquake two years before its occurrence, and hence the genuineness of this part of the title has been questioned. But the most probable supposition is that Amos saw his visions and uttered his prophecies some time before he committed them to writing. After he had finished his mission at Beth-el and returned again to his home in Judah the remarkable earthquake occurred and caused great consternation and flight among the people of the land. Soon after that alarming event, we may suppose, our prophet wrote out his oracles, or perhaps revised them, and added among some other things this statement that his divine call came to him "two years before the well-known earthquake."

Tact and method.

We may see a measure of tact and skill in the manner in which this prophet speaks the word of Jehovah against the heathen, and also against Judah, before he opens upon the "transgressions of Israel." He thus prepares the way for the deeper conviction and inexcusable guiltiness of those to whom his prophecies are mainly directed. Having obtained his reader's tacit assent to the justness of his oracles against the heathen, he can without fear of successful contradiction show that Judah and Israel are truly obnoxious to the same condemnation. All the neighboring nations mentioned in chapters i, 3-ii, 3, had been at some time awed or subdued before the forces of Israel and Judah; but they were not yet overthrown, and the memory of their numerous transgres-

sions was vivid in the prophet's soul. He accordingly first utters against them the judgments which are sure to come. Their walls and palaces and rulers are destined to perish before the fires of Jehovah's wrath. Even upon the southern kingdom of Judah will that fire be sent, "and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem" (ii, 5). But against Israel, who is especially guilty of oppressing the poor and running into all excesses of luxury and moral corruption, he says (ii, 13-16):

> Behold, I am about to press you down,
> As the cart presses which is full of sheaves.
> And flight shall perish from the swift,
> And the strong shall not make his power secure,
> Nor shall the mighty one save his own soul.
> And he that grasps the bow shall not stand fast,
> Nor he that is swift-footed save himself,
> Nor he that rides the horse save his own soul.
> And the strong heart among the mighty ones
> Naked shall flee in that day, saith Jehovah.

Then through the following three chapters we read a series of appeals to the house of Israel, each one of which begins with "Hear ye this word" (iii, 1; iv, 1; v, 1). The sinful kingdom is charged with many offenses, and a long-standing idolatry, and the oracle declares that a mighty nation from beyond Damascus shall utterly destroy the kingdom of Samaria and scatter Israel among all the nations (v, 27; vi, 14; ix, 8, 9). But though "the sinful kingdom" perish from the face of the earth, Jehovah will not suffer "the house of Jacob" to be utterly destroyed. Only the chaff will be driven away by the

Appeals to the sinful kingdom.

winds of divine judgment, while every kernel of the true grain will be preserved in the sieve of Jehovah's chastising love (ix, 9). And so the prophecy closes with an oracle of promise. "The tabernacle of David" (ix, 11), which has become a fallen and broken booth (or tent) as compared with the royal house and throne of which Nathan spoke to David (2 Sam. vii. 16), shall be rebuilded "as in the days of old." The rupture and bitter division consequent upon the revolt of the ten tribes shall be healed, so that what appears now like a ruined hut shall become a glorious united house (comp. Hos. i, 11; Isa. xi, 12, 13; Ezek. xxxvii, 16-24).

The following analytical outline may serve as a help in the more minute study of the different parts of this book of prophecy, and suggest to one pursuing such studies the value of making some similar analysis for himself of the other books of the prophets:

Analysis.

ANALYSIS OF AMOS.

I. Eightfold introductory Oracle. Chapters I and II.
   1. Against Damascus. i, 3-5.
   2. Against Philistia. i, 6-8.
   3. Against Tyre. i, 9-10.
   4. Against Edom. i, 11, 12.
   5. Against Ammon. i, 13-15.
   6. Against Moab. ii, 1-3.
   7. Against Judah. ii, 4, 5.
   8. Against Israel. ii, 6-16.

II. Appeal to the House of Israel. Chapters III-VI.
   1. First Appeal—words of alarm and warning. iii, 1-15.
   2. Second Appeal—upbraidings for persistent hardness in the face of repeated judgments. iv, 1-13.
   3. A lamentation, with various exhortations, complaints, and announcements of woe. v, 1-vi, 14.

III. Visions and accompanying Oracles. Chapters VII-IX.

1. Vision of locusts. vii, 1-3.
2. Vision of fire. vii, 4-6.
3. Vision of the plumb line. vii, 7-9.
4. Conflict with Amaziah. vii, 10-17.
5. Vision of ripe fruit. viii, 1-3.
6. Oracle of doom. viii, 4-14.
7. Vision of the altar. ix, 1-4.
8. Oracle of doom. ix, 5-10.
9. Oracle of promise. ix, 11-15.

JEREMIAH.

Three other prophets, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah, were nearly contemporary with Amos, and they all belong to what is often called "the Assyrian period," that is, the period of Israelitish history during which the great Assyrian empire was dominant in western Asia.[1] This period covered the eighth century before Christ (B. C. 800-700), and extended from the reign of Jeroboam II to the downfall of Samaria, and the carrying away of the ten tribes into exile. Hosea was somewhat younger than Amos, but the subject of his prophecy is much the same. The evils against which Amos had prophesied so strongly had not ceased in the kingdom of Israel, but seem rather

Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah.

[1] "It is no accident," says Cornill, "that the first appearance of genuine history coincided with the first advent of the Assyrians. Historical catastrophies have invariably aroused prophesying in Israel, and for this reason the prophets have been well called the storm-petrels of the world's history. . . . The prophet possesses the capacity of recognizing God in history. He feels it when catastrophies are in the air. He stands on his watch tower and spies out the signs of the times, so as to interpret them to his people, and to point out to them the right way, which will surely guide them out of all danger."—*The Prophets of Israel*, pp. 34, 35.

to have waxed worse and worse. Amos had spoken as a stranger out of the land of Judah, but Hosea was a native of the northern kingdom. "For him," writes W. R. Smith, "there was no escape from the scenes of horror that defiled his native land, and the anguish that expresses itself in every page of his prophecy is the distress of a pure and gentle soul, linked by the closest ties of family affection and national feeling to the sinners who were hurrying Israel onward to the doom he saw so clearly, but of which they refused to hear. And so, while the work of Amos was completed in a single brief mission, the prophecies of Hosea extend over a series of terrible years."[1] But while the work of Amos and Hosea was directed mainly against the sins of the kingdom of Israel, Isaiah and Micah prophesied in the kingdom of Judah. Isaiah, the son of Amoz, was a native of Jerusalem, but "Micah the Morasthite" was from the country town of Moresheth-gath, in the lowlands of Judah. Isaiah seems to have been connected with the royal family, and was bold and familiar in the dwellings of princes; but Micah, the simple countryman, somewhat after the manner of his older contemporary Amos, shows marks of his humble origin and his rustic tastes and sympathies. Thus God makes use of different classes of messengers to voice his truth to men. He can speak through the wise and noble and by the lips of babes.

Other prophets followed these, and the little books

[1] *The Prophets of Israel and their Place in History*, p. 155. New York, 1882.

of Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah represent divine voices from the middle and latter part of the seventh century B. C. But we turn to the two great prophets, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, whose names more than any other are associated with the downfall and captivity of Judah. Jeremiah was in some respects the Hosea of the kingdom of Judah, and we find in his writings not a few allusions to that older prophet by way of incidental appropriations of his language. Jeremiah was the prophet of the decline and fall of Judah as Hosea had been of the kingdom of Israel. But Jeremiah suffered continual persecution at the hands of his generation, and his words were rejected and treated with contempt. He lived, however, to see his predictions verified. He witnessed the fall and desolation of Jerusalem, declined to follow the exiles to Babylon, choosing rather to cast in his lot with the poor remnant which the Chaldean conqueror allowed to remain in the land. He was, however, soon after cruelly carried away to Egypt, where he uttered his final words of doom against the rebels of Judah and the king and gods of Egypt. There, tradition says, he was stoned to death, and so his entire public life as well as his death appear before us like one long martyrdom. A study of Jeremiah, to be comprehensive, must consider (1) his book, (2) his personality, and (3) the spiritual significance of his ministry. These are all matters of absorbing interest.

Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah.

Jeremiah.

1. The Book of Jeremiah has come down to us in a

condition as confused and disorderly as the times in which the prophet lived. Its contents are commonly divided into three unequal sections: (1) Prophecies and events relating to his own people and times (chaps. i-xlv), (2) Prophecies against heathen nations (xlvi-li), and (3) Historical appendix by an editor of Jeremiah's works (lii). But upon closer examination we find that the different prophecies are not arranged in chronological order, and the critical student is further perplexed by reason of the remarkable disagreements between the Hebrew text and that of the Septuagint version. The order of entire prophecies is in a number of cases arranged differently, and not a few passages which exist in Hebrew are not to be found in the Greek translation. It has been estimated that the Hebrew text contains nearly one eighth more words than find any corresponding representation in the Septuagint. Just how all these differences originated it is now impossible to determine. It is hardly sufficient or satisfactory to suppose that they all arose from the carelessness of translators. In a number of passages the Septuagint seems to present clearly the better text. It is therefore more satisfactory to believe that at a very early date there arose two different recensions or editions of the book, and our present Hebrew text exhibits the one and the Septuagint the other. Our English version follows the common masoretic text of the Hebrew throughout.

Confused state of Jeremiah's prophecies.

The thirty-sixth chapter records a very interesting

fact concerning the composition of the Book of Jeremiah. At the prophet's dictation Baruch wrote out in a book roll all the oracles which Jeremiah uttered against Israel and Judah and all the nations, from the days of Josiah unto the fourth year of Jehoiakim. But in the following year, after its public reading in the ears of the people and also before the princes, the roll was brought in and read before the king, who, upon hearing three or four leaves read, cut up and burned the entire book in the open fire that was in the brasier. Thereupon, by command of Jehovah, "Jeremiah took another roll, and gave it to Baruch, the scribe, the son of Neriah; who wrote therein from the mouth of Jeremiah all the words of the book which Jehoiakim, king of Judah, had burned in the fire: and there were added besides unto them many like words" (xxxvi, 32). But Jeremiah lived and prophesied for many years after this date, and prophecies dated in the reign of Zedekiah precede (xxxii, 1) as well as follow this thirty-fifth chapter.

Book destroyed and rewritten.

The repetitions of language and sentiment are also a marked feature of the book. In illustration of this the reader may examine a few out of many similar examples in the following passages: Compare ii, 28, with xi, 13; v, 9, 29, with ix, 9; vi, 13-15, with viii, 10-12; vii, 14, with xxvi, 6; x, 12-16, with li, 15-19. Such repetitions suggest that many of these prophecies were repeatedly uttered or read; and perhaps some of the apparent confusion of the book may be due to this fact.

Repetitions.

But in spite of such repetitions and lack of chronological order the Book of Jeremiah gives us a most lifelike picture of those troublous times. In fact, there are some advantages in this seeming disarrangement of the several parts. Reckoning the oracles against the heathen in chapters xlvi-xlix as one great piece, Ewald finds twenty-three distinct sections in the entire book, each designated by a separate heading. But the reader should go through the entire book for himself, and note the different headings of distinct prophecies; and he will find more than twenty-three distinctive sections. These all show that the prophet Jeremiah was a mighty living voice in those dark times of Judah's downfall; and though his messages were not then heeded, the record of them as they now lie before us is the most valuable piece of literature we possess for giving an inside view of the national life of Israel at that period. Its value, therefore, as a contribution to biblical history, as well as to oracles of prophecy, can hardly be overestimated.

The book a picture of the times.

2. The personality of this prophet presents one of the most remarkable character studies of the Old Testament. There is no other life like his depicted in the Hebrew Scriptures. More fully than any other has he exhibited himself in his utterances. One exclamation, characteristic of his entire ministry, is the familiar passage at the beginning of the ninth chapter, "O that my head were waters, and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night for the slain of the daughter of my people!"

A striking personality.

So striking a feature of his personality is this that it has become common to call any doleful utterance or writing "a Jeremiad."

His isolation and trials.

Whatever friends he had about him in the earlier part of his life, he seems to us for the most part to have stood apart and alone. "The nation was against him," says Stanley. "In the day when he uttered his lament over Josiah he lost his last hope in the house of Judah. From that hour the charm of the royal line of David was broken; the institution which had of itself sustained the monarchy had lost its own vital power. The nobles were exasperated against him by his fearless rebukes of their oppression and luxury. Most of all, he was hated and cursed—the bitterest trial, in every time—by the two sacred orders to which he himself belonged. He was one of those rare instances in the Jewish history in which priest and prophet were combined, and by a singularly tragical fate he lived precisely at that age in which both of those great institutions seemed to have reached the utmost point of degradation and corruption; both, after the trials and vicissitudes of centuries, in the last extremity of the nation of which they were both supports, broke down and failed. Between the priesthood and the prophets there had hitherto been more or less of conflict; but now that conflict was exchanged for a fatal union—'a wonderful and horrible thing was committed in the land; the prophets prophesied falsely, and the priests bore rule by their means; and the people loved to have it so' (v. 31)—and he who by each of his call-

ings was naturally led to sympathize with both was the doomed antagonist of both—victim of one of the strongest of human passions, the hatred of priests against a priest who attacks his own order, the hatred of prophets against a prophet who ventures to have a voice and a will of his own. His own village of Anathoth was for him a nest of conspirators against his life."[1]

His divine call.

The divine call of Jeremiah as recorded in chapter i, 4-10, is worthy of special study. He is informed that he was preordained before his birth to be a prophet, and the assurance is given him of the divine presence and deliverance. A most profound idea of heavenly inspiration and power is conveyed by the words, "Jehovah put forth his hand and touched my mouth, and said, Behold, I have put my words in thy mouth: see, I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to pluck up and to break down and to destroy and to overthrow; to build and to plant." The language implies not only the operations of a deep conviction wrought in the soul by the Spirit of God, but also some elements of vision. The hand of God put on one's mouth is an ideal of heavenly anointing for a holy mission. One should compare with this call of Jeremiah that of Isaiah as written in Isa. vi, and that of Ezekiel as detailed in the first three chapters of his book. The personality of each of these great prophets is differentiated and defined to a great extent by the peculiar manner of their call. Jeremiah's

[1] *Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church,* Second Series, pp. 571, 572. New York, 1869.

has in it less of the visional, but is gifted with no less authority from heaven.

It was some five years after Jeremiah's call and first prophecies that the book of the law was found in the temple (2 Kings xxii, 3-13). This discovery led to great reforms in the kingdom, and we may well believe that our prophet was no small factor in promoting those reforms. He was one of those prophets who, with the king, and priests and all the people, "made a covenant before Jehovah, to keep his commandments and his testimonies and his statutes with all the heart and with all the soul" (2 Kings xxiii, 3). The first eight verses of the eleventh chapter of Jeremiah are most naturally understood as the prophet's own declaration of his activity in proclaiming "the words of the covenant" as recorded in "the book of the covenant which was found in the house of Jehovah." In all the happy results which followed, and which are mentioned in 2 Kings xxiii, the soul of Jeremiah must have greatly rejoiced. Some thirteen years of prosperity were given the realm under the righteous rule of Josiah after the reforms which began in the eighteenth year of his reign. But what a bitter shock and reaction came over the whole nation when Josiah fell! It is difficult to account for the infatuation which led the king of Judah to march against Neco, king of Egypt. He fell in the battle, and they brought him to Jerusalem, "and all Judah and Jerusalem mourned for Josiah, and Jeremiah lamented for him" (see 2 Chron. xxxv, 20-27). From that sad day

His relation to the book of the law.

the prophet appears as one smitten with an irremediable anguish.

His burdens and persecutions.

The burden of Jeremiah's prophesying from that time onward was the certain ruin of Judah and Jerusalem. "They are turned back to the iniquities of their forefathers," he cries (xi, 10); "they are gone after other gods to serve them; they have broken the covenant which I made with their fathers." His messages and warnings had no power with the nobles or the people. He was persecuted. He was put in the stocks and made to feel the reproach so keenly as to cry out, "O Lord, thou hast deceived me, and I was deceived: thou art stronger than I, and hast prevailed: I am become a laughingstock all the day, every one mocketh me" (xx, 7). He was smitten by the princes, and cast for many days "into the dungeon house and into the cells" (xxxvii, 16), and then again let down with cords into a damp pit where "there was no water, but mire, and Jeremiah sank in the mire" (xxxviii, 6), and thus remained until mercifully delivered by command of the king.

Malediction of xviii, 19-23.

We need not wonder greatly that in the depths of his misery this prophet at times gave vent to maledictions like that most terrible passage in chapter xviii, 19-23. They are not to be explained as in harmony with the spirit of the Gospel. They exhibit the spirit and power of Elijah rather than that of Jesus. And yet, like the vindictive psalms, they may not be very different, in their expression of the demands of divine righteousness, from that which is

suggested by the terrible apocalyptic phrase "the wrath of the Lamb." When we consider such an outburst of wrath against the enemies of God and man as one extreme of Jeremiah's thought, and at once connect it with such tender and affecting cries as we read in iv, 19-22, or in viii, 18-22, we can the better appreciate the breadth and depth of the soul of this man of sorrows.

His qualities and character.

In the midst of unspeakable sorrows, and with a tender spirit united with moral firmness unsurpassed, with the certain doom of his nation before his eye, and yet with all the yearnings of a Rachel's heart (xxxi, 15), refusing to be comforted, we have in Jeremiah a most remarkable personality. "He has," says Cheyne, "none of the so-called apathy of the Stoic; he may use bold words at the risk of his life, but he does so with quivering lips. . . . One of his chief qualifications is precisely his sense of weakness; he needs no thorn in the flesh to make him pray to be clothed upon with divine strength. He is not a hero by nature, but by grace; and in his sometimes strange confessions we clearly read that grace never expelled nature. His life is at once the most natural and the most supernatural in the Old Testament."[1] To this we should add the following words of Stanley: "He was the solitary fortress, the column of iron, the wall of brass, fearless, undismayed, unconfounded—the one grand, immovable figure, which alone redeems the miserable downfall of his country from triviality and shame —for forty years, day by day, at early morning (xxv,

[1] *Jeremiah: His Life and Times*, p. 36. New York, 1888.

3), standing to deliver his mournful warnings, his searching rebukes, in the royal chamber or in the temple court. He was the prophet of unwelcome, unpalatable truth, from whose clear vision all illusions had vanished away; in whom the high poetic aspirations of former times were transformed into the hard prose of common life; yet a prose which itself becomes more poetical than poetry, because of its own exceeding tragical simplicity." [1]

Spiritual significance.

3. The spiritual significance of such a character becomes a study of highest moment. "The human race knows itself and its environment, and its experiences, only in literature. As the sweetness of flowers must be gathered by the bees into their combs before we can possess it as honey, so the lessons of life are ours only as authors have gathered them into books. We see nature through the eyes of the poets; and but for the historians we should have, as a race, no memory. Men without letters must remain like the American Indians, on the level of the beavers and the wolves, or sink even below that. Greece began to know herself in Homer's 'Iliad' and 'Odyssey.' If, then, the profound significance of the fall of Judah was to be known and felt by its own age, or by succeeding ages, some great soul must taste the bitterness of its dregs, and must immortalize its unparalleled sorrows in a book." [2] Accordingly, from the Book of Jeremiah

[1] *Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church*, Second Series, pp. 574, 575.

[2] *Jeremiah: a Character Study*, by William G. Ballantine, p. 8. Chicago, 1892.

and the great personality therein immortalized, we gather imperishable lessons of the righteousness and severity of God; of the depths of human depravity, and the extremes of wickedness to which the perverse mind may go. We see the picture of a retiring, shrinking child of tender emotions made bold and fearless by the power of the Spirit. In this union of affecting sympathy and tremendous power we find a conspicuous type of "the man of sorrows." The spiritual significance of Jeremiah is seen mainly in the fact that he more than any other Old Testament character is like the Lord Jesus when, six hundred years later, he wept over the same rebellious city, and cried: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killeth the prophets, and stoneth them that are sent unto her! how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate" (Matt. xxiii, 37, 38).

So the saints of ancient as well as those of the New Testament times were made partakers of the sufferings of Christ (comp. Rom. viii, 17; 2 Cor. i, 7; Phil. iii, 10; 2 Tim. ii, 12; 1 Pet. iv, 13). Grotius and some others have thought that the suffering "servant of Jehovah," depicted in Isa. liii, was a prophetic description of Jeremiah. This much is true, that Jeremiah, suffering at the hands of priests and princes of his nation, despised and rejected by his generation, foretelling the doom of Jerusalem, but seeing beyond that judgment of ruin and exile a brighter

Typical of Christ.

day, is truly typical of Jesus Christ. The numerous analogies suggest themselves. The prophecies of a better day to come, uttered by a weeping seer amid the ruins of Judah and Jerusalem, have a significance and force they could not have in times more hopeful. Out of the terrific gloom, certain as Jehovah's oath and promise, comes a still small voice which is all the more impressive by reason of its being heard amid the shock of wind and earthquake and fire: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah. . . . I will put my law in their inward parts, and in their heart will I write it; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. . . . They shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them: for I will forgive their iniquity, and their sin will I remember no more" (xxxi, 31-34).

EZEKIEL.

The exilic prophet.

In the Book of Ezekiel we meet with a different style of prophecy. Jeremiah's oracles were uttered in the midst of Jerusalem; Ezekiel's are a great voice from the land of the exile, and to a noticeable extent they take on the form of apocalyptic visions. By the rivers of Babylon he sat down, and probably often wept when he remembered Zion (Psa. cxxxvii, 1). He dates his call in the fifth year of the captivity of King Jehoiachin (i, 2), and the latest date mentioned in his book is the twenty-seventh year (xxix, 17). So his prophetic ministry must have extended over about a quarter of a century, and covered nearly

the first half of the seventy years of the exile. He had not improbably seen Jeremiah in the days of his youth, and must certainly have known of his prophesying and his sufferings. But while Jeremiah was chiefly a messenger of woe to the doomed city and people of Judah, Ezekiel is noticeably a prophet of restoration. We find the Book of Jeremiah in hopeless confusion, and see in it evidences of having been put in its present form by degrees, and by other hands than those of its author. But the Book of Ezekiel is almost artistically arranged, and no critic or scholar has been able to prove in it anything sufficient to warrant a doubt that it was not written and arranged throughout by the prophet himself.

In an analysis of this prophetic book we may divide it into two sections or principal parts: the first announcing divine judgments upon the rebellious house of Israel and the heathen nations (chaps. i-xxxii); the second announcing the restoration and final glorification of the purified Israel (xxxiii-xlviii). The oracles against seven heathen nations in chapters xxv-xxxii are, however, so complete a section and subject by themselves as perhaps to justify a threefold division of the book. But our chief interest in the prophecy attaches to the concluding part, which is full of consolation and assurance for the house of Israel. The promises of restoration are set over against some form of trouble which visited the nation, or in ideals of glory which are enhanced by contrast with some clouded background. So in chapter xxxiv, as an offset to the work of unfaithful shepherds who

Scope and plan of the book.

had caused the flock to be scattered abroad, Jehovah, like a good shepherd, will seek his scattered sheep, and lead them into rich pastures upon the mountains of Israel. As an offset to the evils Israel suffered from the surrounding nations, the doom of Edom is foretold as a specimen of the manner in which Jehovah will avenge his people on their heartless enemies (xxxv). As an offset to the prophecy against the mountains of Israel in chapter vi, 1-7, there comes in chapter xxxvi, 1-15, a promise to restore and beautify all that was laid waste. The thirty-seventh chapter is notable for two symbolical pictures—the resurrection of the dry bones (verses 1-14), and the two rods which represented the divided kingdoms of Israel and Judah (verses 15-28). These symbols showed that Israel's restoration should be as life from the dead, and result in the union of all the tribes again in one nation. Chapters xxxviii and xxxix contain a great apocalyptic picture of the last conflict between God and the lawless hostile forces of the world. The imagery appears to have been furnished by the terrible invasion of the Scythians "from the uttermost parts of the north," which spread consternation over all western Asia about the time that Ezekiel was a lad in his Judean home. The same imagery is appropriated in Rev. xx, 8, 9, and there as here portrays the final effort of the powers of evil to destroy the people and kingdom of God. Such sublime prophetic pictures are not to be interpreted literally as accurate predictions of some particular historic event, but are rather a figure of moral and spirit-

ual conflict which may continue for indefinite times. The one great comforting assurance is that the forces of evil shall ultimately perish under the power of the Most High.

In like manner we understand the last nine chapters of Ezekiel as an elaborate symbolic picture of the kingdom of God on earth. These chapters also have their New Testament counterpart in the new heavens and new earth which are portrayed in the last two chapters of Revelation. The prophet is carried in the visions of God to a very high mountain (xl, 2; comp. Rev. xxi, 10), and thence beholds a new temple, new ordinances of worship, a river of waters of life, a new land of Israel with new tribal divisions, and a new city named JEHOVAH-SHAMMAH, which means, *the Lord is there.* From his point of view, as an exile by the rivers of Babylon, smitten with grief as he remembered Zion, and its ruined city and temple, no ideal of restoration could be more attractive than that of a perfect temple, a continual service, a holy priesthood, a new city and land supplied with the living waters of a never-failing river that would make the desert places blossom as the rose. All this may be explained as a symbolic figure of the kingdom of heaven which Jesus likened unto a grain of mustard seed.

Chapters xl-xlviii.

The personality of Ezekiel is less striking than that of Jeremiah. The latter presses itself upon our attention in every oracle and act, but the prophet of the exile is comparatively hidden under his book. Both these eminent men were

A priestly prophet.

of priestly families, but Jeremiah was more of a prophet, Ezekiel more of a priest. In his work on *The Position of Ezekiel in Old Testament Prophecy* (Berlin, 1895) Arndt declares that Jeremiah is the last great prophet, but Ezekiel the first scribe and spiritual father of Judaism. Accordingly, we must note the prominence which Ezekiel gives to the ceremonials of worship. Isaiah, Micah, and Jeremiah cried out against the worthlessness of burnt offerings and sacrifices (Isa. i, 10-15; Mic. vi, 6-8; Jer. vi, 20; vii, 21), but Ezekiel (xliii, 18-27; xliv, 15-31; xlv, 17) prescribes an elaborate priestly ritual for sin offerings and trespass offerings and every sort of oblations. These facts have their explanation in the conditions and tendencies of the different times. During the closing period of the kingdom of Judah the temple worship had become so empty of spiritual significance by reason of a corrupt and idolatrous priesthood that the burnt offerings and sacrifices and incense became displeasing and even an abomination to Jehovah (Jer. vi, 20; Isa. i, 13). But after the judgment of national ruin and the purging chastisements of exile the priest-prophet perceives that a genuine restoration will require a restored temple and a revised ritual. Hence his minute elaboration of such ideals in the closing chapters of his book. Critical research has shown a natural relationship between Ezekiel and the priestly Code of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers quite analogous to that between Jeremiah and the legislation of Deuteronomy.

The Book of Ezekiel is entitled to exceptional rank

as a literary study. We have already spoken of its artistic unity and orderly arrangement. But that which attracts the notice of every careful reader is the elaborate minuteness with which this writer aims to describe his visions. Ballantine calls Ezekiel "the Dante of the Bible. The similarities are many, and more than superficial. Both authors have the same religious aim, the same stupendous themes, and both have the same characteristic of producing great effects by precision in minutiæ of description and by accumulating particulars. We might make such a contrast between Ezekiel and Isaiah as Macaulay has made between Dante and Milton. Indeed, we know of no more helpful preparation for the study of the style of Ezekiel than the careful perusal of Macaulay's analysis of the differences of those two great poets." [1]

Literary characteristics.

The writer just cited illustrates by a comparison of the vision of Isaiah, which is all sublimely told in the thirteen verses of his sixth chapter, and that of Ezekiel, which not only fills minutely the twenty-eight verses of the first chapter, but which the seer "keeps before his readers by dramatic references through eleven long chapters." Of the book as a whole he says (p. 4) that it "is vast and grand like the Colosseum at Rome; and like the Colosseum, it has served as a quarry from which subsequent builders have freely drawn precious materials for their palaces and churches. In the New Testa-

[1] *Ezekiel: a Literary Study of his Prophecy*, by William G. Ballantine, pp. 8, 9. Chicago, 1892.

ment the Book of Revelation is largely built out of the polished and sculptured blocks of Ezekiel. Jesus himself found in the thirty-fourth chapter of Ezekiel a preparation for his discourse about the good shepherd recorded in the tenth chapter of John."

Finally we notice the large amount of apocalyptical elements in this book. It was most natural that the Apocalypse of John should have appropriated many of its figures; and more than twenty-five distinct citations or allusions of the seer of Patmos show his obligations to the priest-prophet of the Chebar. We find a notable number and variety of figures in Ezekiel. On a nature so glowingly sensitive to the ideals of vision as his the huge and grotesque symbols of Babylonian art must have made a deep impression. Not only visional symbols, but also symbolic actions, appear in his book; parables also, and allegories, and numerous metaphors. Altogether, therefore, the prophecy of Ezekiel is unique among the books of the Hebrew canon.

Apocalyptic character.

CHAPTER IV.

COMPILATIONS OF PROPHETIC ORACLES.

Eternal Truth seeks many a secret soul
That meditates in silence, and grows strong
With thoughts divine, scorned by the careless throng
And clamorous crowd that brook no such control;
Thoughts that rush onward toward a heavenly goal
Can only to the pure in heart belong.
These seek not glory in a sounding name;
And while their thoughts become a living voice
Inspired to make men tremble or rejoice,
They hide themselves away from mortal fame,
Though by them God set half the world aflame.
Heaven's whispered truth is mightier than the noise
Of earthquake, wind and fire,—a living Word,
Which uttered once must evermore be heard.

CHAPTER IV.

COMPILATIONS OF PROPHETIC ORACLES.

In this chapter we look upon another phase of Old Testament prophecy, and one which only in modern times has attracted general attention. Compilations of proverbs attached to the name of Solomon, and of psalms to the name of David, were recognized more readily than a variety of different prophecies associated with the name of one representative prophet. But it has come to pass that there are now comparatively few biblical scholars of acknowledged rank who accept the Books of Isaiah and Zechariah as the sole product of these two great prophets. It seems, therefore, not only important, but quite necessary to the interests of truth, that all faithful students of the Bible, both young and old, should be accurately informed on the questions involved, and be able to judge for themselves without passion or prejudice. We should all study to know the exact truth in these matters and nothing but the truth.

Compilations of prophecy.

No sound criticism will ignore the weight of an old and unanimous tradition. Such an opinion has the right of way until set aside by valid evidence of its error. But certainly it is possible for an ancient and venerable tradition to have originated in some misunderstanding; and, having once

Value of traditions.

been started, centuries of repetition cannot add one whit to its value. Age cannot change an error into truth. A tradition that originated in such conjectures about the authorship of the biblical writings as those cited from the Jewish Talmud in a previous chapter (see above, p. 53), has in itself no considerable claim to respect. And yet it is very certain that a number of the current notions about the different books of the Bible originated in no more trustworthy a source than such rabbinical conjecture.

Some devout persons show a disposition of alarm, and even take offense, at the scientific discussion of these questions of criticism. It is, moreover, the infirmity and misfortune of not a few to imagine that such questions can now be settled by external authority. The plain fact is that some of the main points at issue are of such a nature as not now to admit of final settlement. The two short prophecies of Joel and Obadiah have come down to us as separate books, and the most competent critics cannot agree as to their dates. It is doubtful if even general agreement be ever reached. Some, like Ewald, regard Joel as one of the oldest books of prophecy, while others place it among the latest in the canon. We would all be glad to *know* the real facts, and much more about author and date than we are likely ever to find out; but in lack of that perfect knowledge we must try to be satisfied with what is attainable, and, above all, to bear in mind that the main purpose of all these inspired scriptures is to be found in their profitableness for teaching, reproof,

Open questions.

correction, and instruction in righteousness (2 Tim. iii, 16)—not in knowing their authorship and dates.

There are a few who are misled into the idea that our Lord and the evangelists and apostles have authoritatively settled the question of the authorship of Isaiah and the Pentateuch by such references as are found in Matt. iii, 3; iv, 14; xii, 17; Mark vii, 6; Luke iv, 17; John i, 23; v, 46, 47; Rom. x, 16, 20. But the bare fact in these citations is that reference is made by current and popular titles to well-known books of Scripture. The reader will do well to observe in what a variety of formulas of reference one and the same Old Testament passage is cited in Matt xxii, 31; Mark xii, 26; and Luke xx, 37. The entire body of Hebrew Scripture was recognized as a treasure-house of divine knowledge, and it was a matter of no practical importance to inquire or think of questions of literary composition. It was for the evangelists a matter of indifference whether one say "God says," or "Moses says," or "the book says." Compare also Heb. iii, 7, and iv, 7. Will any logical mind insist that it was any part of the purpose of Jesus or the New Testament writers, in such familiar allusions, to express an authoritative judgment on the authorship or composition of the books referred to? Or, in other words, does the quotation of a scripture, or a reference to it and its traditional author in accordance with common and popular methods of quotation, commit the person who makes such reference to an authoritative decision as to the authorship of the book cited? We trust the day is

New Testament citations.

past when any sober defender of the Christian faith will presume to affirm a proposition so unreasonable.[1]

It remains, then, that the question of the composition of such books as those of Isaiah and Zechariah must be determined by a thorough scientific examination of their contents. The main facts on which our judgment must be based may be so stated that any intelligent and conscientious student may be safely left to form his own conclusion.

Contents the main witness.

THE BOOK OF ISAIAH.

Any reader who will take pains to examine this book may find therein the following seven distinct collections or divisions:

1. Prophecies concerning Judah and Jerusalem. Chapters i-xii.
2. Prophecies concerning foreign nations. xiii-xxiii.
3. An Apocalypse of judgment and redemption. xxiv-xxvii.
4. A fivefold book of woes. xxviii-xxxiii.
5. Contrasted future of Edom and Jehovah ransomed. xxxiv, xxxv.
6. Historical chapters from the Book of Kings. xxxvi-xxxix.
7. Restoration from Babylonian exile. xl-lxvi.

By combining chapters xxiv-xxxv, which all bear an apocalyptic character, we may reduce the book to five rather than seven parts, and yet it is better for purposes of fuller analysis to follow the above sevenfold division. The first fact to be noted is that, whether these different parts be the composition of one author or of many, they are obviously different collections and of different dates.

[1] For a number of different individual opinions on this subject, see the Appendix to this volume.

The first twelve chapters form a group of oracles which might once have been an independent collection with chapter xii as a concluding psalm. The same is true of the next eleven chapters, which are distinguished by the beginning of each separate prophecy with the word "burden." Such groups or collections of similar oracles, however, are perfectly compatible with a single authorship, and we have noticed the same thing in Jer. xlvi-li and Ezek. xxv-xxxii. But it is difficult to see with what propriety the historical chapters xxxvi-xxxix were ever ascribed to Isaiah as their author. They are an excerpt from the Book of Kings (2 Kings xviii, 13, 17-xx, 19), and sustain the relation of an appendix to the preceding part of Isaiah, just as Jer. lii is an appendix to what precedes it in that book of prophecies, and was also appropriated with slight condensation from 2 Kings xxiv, 18-xxv, 30. The historical part of these chapters as they stand in Isaiah have no more real claim to be the composition of the prophet than has the psalm of Hezekiah in chap. xxxix, 9-20.

Obviously different collections.

Of the thirty-five chapters which precede this historical fragment the following portions are now quite generally believed to be from some other writer or writers than Isaiah:

Parts believed non-Isaianic.

Chapter ii, 2-4, is identical with Mic. iv, 1-3, and is believed by some to be a quotation from Micah; by others an extract both by Isaiah and Micah from some older prophet.

Chapter xiii, 1-xiv, 23, is admitted by Delitzsch to

have "no historical contemporaneous attachment to Isaiah's own time." It is maintained that the overthrow of Babylon by a Median power, and the restoration of Israel to their own land "is a consolatory hope for which a prophet of the beginning of the Babylonian exile is better fitted to be the organ than Isaiah, for whom, as for Micah (iv, 10), Babylon, as the mistress of the world, formed the farthest bound of his horizon, and who did not yet proclaim the fall of Nineveh, as Nahum and Zephaniah afterward did for the first time."[1]

Chapter xv, 1-xvi, 12, is a prophecy concerning Moab which Isaiah appears to have appropriated, and which he says in xvi, 13, was spoken "in time past." But now, he declares, in the next verse, the oracle shall have a fulfillment "within three years." It is indeed possible that this oracle on Moab may have been written by Isaiah himself in a previous time, and now reproduced with the supplement of xvi, 13 and 14, but a minute study of the Hebrew text discloses so many differences of tone and style from the acknowledged writings of Isaiah that most critics now assign it to another author.

Chapter xxi, 1-10, is thought by some to refer to a conquest of Babylon by the Assyrians under Sargon about B. C. 710, in Isaiah's time, when Merodach-baladan undertook to maintain an independent government and assumed to be king of Babylon (comp. Isa. xxxix, 1). But it is difficult to see how or why those

[1] Delitzsch, *Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah, in loco.*

wars of the Assyrians against Merodach-baladan should in Isaiah's day be spoken of as assaults by Elam and Media; nor could that Assyrian suppression of the Babylonian usurper be properly announced by the words, "Babylon is fallen, is fallen" (verse 9). For these reasons this "burden of the wilderness of the sea" is most naturally explained as a composition belonging to the times of the Babylonian exile.

Chapters xxiv-xxvii form a section complete in itself, and all criticism has failed thus far to agree upon the questions of its authorship and date. It is a highly wrought apocalyptic poem, full of rich suggestions, but so ideal in its aim as to transcend the limits of any one historical occasion.[1] We learn from it that only by a long series of judgments and triumphs will the true Israel of God attain their ultimate glorification. The most we can say, therefore, is that these chapters may or may not have come from Isaiah, but most modern critics pronounce against their Isaianic authorship.

Chapters xxxiv-xxxv are also of an apocalyptic character. The first is especially against Edom, but also "against all the nations." For similar feeling against

[1] For analysis, translation, and annotation of these obscure chapters, see my *Biblical Apocalyptics*, pp. 98-108. Here is a conspicuous example of an oracle so vague and general in its allusions as to leave it practically impossible to assign it with certainty to any known historical occasion. Some who take offense at the partition of the Book of Isaiah among a number of different prophets of God imagine that the failure of critics to agree on the date and occasion of such a prophecy as Isa. xxiv-xxvii is a valid presumption against their whole procedure. But on the hypothesis of Isaianic authorship it is just as impossible to determine the historical occasion of these chapters. If a hundred critics agree that this oracle is not from Isaiah, it does not invalidate that conclusion by averring that no two of the hundred can agree on the same date. This same kind of disagreement might occur among a hundred writers who agreed that Isaiah was the author.

Edom, see Ezek. xxv, 12-14; Obad., verses 10-16; Mal. i, 2-5; Psa. cxxxvii, 7. The second offsets the picture of judgment against Edom by a glorious ideal of the Messianic age. Compare xxxiv, 13, with xxxv, 7. The general allusions, the tone and style, and the idea of the ransomed exiles returning and coming unto Zion (xxxv, 10), all tend to prove these chapters a product of the time of the Babylonian exile.

Here, then, is a considerable portion of the Book of Isaiah, aside from the last twenty-seven chapters, which is denied Isaianic authorship. Those portions which remain, and are generally believed to have been written by the son of Amoz, are i-xii; xiv, 24-32; xvii-xx; xxi, 11-xxiii; xxviii-xxxiii. Such a result of criticism seems to take away from the honor and position in which Isaiah has so long been held. This, some will say, is "destructive criticism." But when one calmly inquires, *What has been destroyed?* he may find it very difficult to furnish a correct answer that does not at the same time vindicate the criticism and show it to be not only a legitimate procedure, but an obligation that rests upon every thorough student of the Holy Scriptures. If it can be shown that nothing has been destroyed but erroneous notions of Hebrew prophecy, all lovers of truth will thank God for such destructive criticism. All intelligent readers ought certainly to see that the denial of the Isaianic authorship of a given prophecy is by no means a denial of its truths, its lessons, or its revelations. Its value for rebuke, correction, and instruction in righteousness

Result of criticism.

remains the same, and may become the more potent by our knowing its true historic place. And if, as is not infrequently the case, sufficient data for determining the historic occasion are wanting, it is but a mark of wisdom and truth to acknowledge the fact, and refrain from unwarranted assertions. Many a scripture whose date and human authorship are unknown may be seen to embody a word of the Lord that is profitable for all times.

Reasons for believing chapters xl-lvi non-Isaianic.

We pass now to point out the main grounds on which biblical scholars of our day so generally pronounce against the Isaianic authorship of the last great section of the book (xl-lxvi). Besides notable differences of literary style and peculiarities of a doctrinal character which distinguish these chapters from those which are unquestionably from Isaiah, the writer's point of view is the period of the Babylonian exile. He refers to Cyrus as a well-known character, a conqueror whom Jehovah has stirred up from the sunrising, and given peoples and kings to trample under foot (xli, 2, 25); he is moved to build God's city and to send his exiles home (xlv, 13); he is God's eagle from a far country (xlvi, 11). He is the *shepherd* (xliv, 28) and the *anointed* of Jehovah (xlv, 1), whom the God of Israel thus names and surnames, though he knows him not (xlv, 4). He performs his pleasure by "saying of Jerusalem, She shall be built, and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid" (xliv, 28). The language in all these passages as naturally implies that Cyrus was already moving on the

stage of action as Isa. vii, 4, 5, implies that Rezin and Pekah were contemporaneous with Isaiah and Ahaz.

Furthermore, such passages as xliii, 14; xlvi, 1; xlvii, 1-7; xlviii, 14-20, in which Babylon is mentioned as an actually existing oppressor, would be exceedingly unnatural in a writer living more than a century before the exile. With what propriety could a prophet of Isaiah's time call upon Jehovah's servant Jacob, and say, "Go forth out of Babylon, and flee from the Chaldeans"?

Some of these passages and others besides them show that the Jewish people were at that time in exile; Judah was a desolation, and Jerusalem and the temple were in ruins. "Thy holy cities are become a wilderness," he cries; "Zion is become a wilderness, Jerusalem a desolation. Our holy and our beautiful house, where our fathers praised thee, is burned with fire; and all our pleasant things are laid waste" (lxiv, 10, 11). "Our adversaries have trodden down thy sanctuary" (lxiii, 18; comp. xlii, 22-25; xliv, 26-28).

All these and not a few other passages resolve themselves into one united testimony to prove that the standpoint of the author is not the time of Isaiah, the son of Amoz, but the latter part of the period of Babylonian exile. From this point of view the entire prophecy of chapters xl-lvi is most naturally understood and explained as a word of consolation to the captive Israelites. The first words are a blessed oracle of assurance: "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye to the heart of

Historical standpoint.

Jerusalem, and cry unto her that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned; that she hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins" (xl, 1, 2). Jehovah has raised up a mighty deliverer, even Cyrus, and he is already advancing from the north. Bel must bow down; Nebo must stoop. The idols of Babylon are to be carried off as so much good-for-nothing rubbish (xlvi, 1, 2). The proud daughter of Babylon is to be humbled in the dust, and exposed to bitter shame (xlvii, 1-5). But the captive daughter of Zion is to awake, put on her beautiful garments, and depart from the land of the Chaldeans (lii, 1, 2; xlviii, 20). In perfect accord with all these ideals of restoration there is also associated not a little Messianic prophecy. For as Isaiah connected in thought the coming of the "shoot out of the stock of Jesse" (xi, 1) with the fall of the power of Assyria (comp. x, 24-34), so this great prophet of the exile connects the coming of the same redeeming Saviour with the deliverance from Babylon, and sees in the foreground the creation of a new Jerusalem, a new heavens, and a new earth (lxv, 17-25).

It is no answer to these proofs of the exile date of these prophecies to affirm that it was *possible* for God to have inspired Isaiah to write them. It is not a question of such possibilities at all, but of a rational exposition of the import of language. No issue is raised against the *supernatural;* but objection is urged against the *unnatural* and far-fetched. It is not a prophecy written after the restoration; but one declaring that restoration from Chaldean

Natural or supernatural?

exile is at hand. The idea of some, who undertake to maintain the Isaianic authorship, that the prophet through all these chapters transports himself into a future age, and from that future standpoint predicts a future still more distant, is a violent and unnatural hypothesis. Occasional instances of what some have called the "prophetic perfect," as in Isa. v, 13; ix, 1-7, are no real parallels. Their immediate context clearly prevents misapprehension. So the famous Messianic passage in Isa. lii, 13-liii is no proof, as some have argued, that the suffering "servant of Jehovah" must or may be relegated to the past as truly as the desolation of Zion and the temple in lxiv, 10, 11. For the Servant is first presented, in lii, 13-15, as an ideal of the future, and introduced with the visional word "Behold;" and only after the picture is thus set forth does the language take on the descriptive style, and employ the present and perfect tenses. Very different are the repeated allusions in these chapters to well-known facts of the time of the Jewish exile.

What is lost, and what gained?

Let us now inquire if anything of value is lost from the Book of Isaiah by these results of critical investigation. What is lost and what is gained by these disclosures?

Assuming that the results of criticism thus far presented are valid, the only true answer to the question proposed is that nothing whatever of real value is lost, while, on the other hand, very much is gained. We lose, no doubt, some measures of regard for Isaiah as the author of a large amount of scripture. It may be urged

that this criticism takes away from the famous son of Amoz much of the glory in which he has long been shining. We naturally feel a sense of disappointment and of loss when any favorite author is denied a composition which has long been associated with his name. But it requires only a little wholesome reflection in order to perceive that it can be no real glory to Isaiah to insist on crediting him with what is not his own. If we allow him only those chapters which the most radical criticism concedes, he will still hold among the Hebrew prophets a rank resembling that of Milton among the English poets. But the faithful student of the Bible will be more concerned to know the truth than to maintain the supposed glory of Isaiah or of any other man. It would doubtless add still more to the reputation of Isaiah if one could show that he was also the author of the Book of Job. But no true friend of the prophet and no lover of the truth would wish to force that honor on him unless his title to it were beyond all question.

The theological disputant who has been accustomed to cite the mention of Cyrus by name (xliv, 28; xlv, 1) as an evidence of the supernatural in prophecy will feel that he has lost a strong argument. For surely the calling of a man by name a hundred years before his birth, and the prediction that he would order the rebuilding of the temple, when, at the time, the temple was still standing, are very remarkable. But a false argument can never permanently help the cause of truth. The careful reader will observe that neither the passage cited nor its context

The references to Cyrus.

warrants the interpretation assumed in the argument. Twice before this mention of his name has the great conqueror from the East and the North (xli, 2, 25) been referred to as one already on the stage of history, and when he is mentioned by name it is not done after the manner of prediction, as in 1 Kings xiii, 2, where Josiah is thus mentioned by name. To ignore the many obvious allusions to facts of the time of the exile, as apparent in Isa. xl-xlviii, or to explain them as utterances of a writer who "is immersed in spirit in the future," is a very unnatural presumption. It is perfectly safe to say that had not these chapters been bound up with the Isaiah volume no one would ever have thought of them as originating in the times of Isaiah, or have supposed that Cyrus was named in the prophecy before his actual appearance in the East.

So far, therefore, from losing anything of value by a critical study which exposes ancient errors, the imaginary losses are rather substantial gains. We gain, moreover, a truer insight into the real lessons of specific prophecies when we come to know, as nearly as possible, their historic setting. If it be found that the Book of Isaiah is veritably a library of prophecy rather than the composition of one and the same writer, we are the richer by the discovery. We thus have many inspired voices, uttering their imperishable words under a great variety of conditions, and all of them speaking eternal truths of God, rather than one voice, speaking in such unnatural varieties of tone, and apparently from times and places so separated from

Gain rather than loss.

each other, that one may well be in doubt and perplexity as to the real nature of the voice itself.

It may lend a tenfold interest to the study of such a book as Isaiah if we come to understand that its numerous diverse oracles are of various authorship, each one significant in its own particular scope, and full of living interest when understood in the light of its own time. One constant aim of the student is, in such case, to transfer himself into the very position of the prophet, see things from his point of view, and feel as far as possible the same inspiration which of old thrilled the messenger of God. So long as the book bears upon its face so many marks of compilation, it would seem that no intelligent reader should hesitate to accept with a sense of profit and delight a critical showing of date and authorship which makes each separate oracle take on new life and naturalness. The earnest seeker after the truth will never presume to dissect such prophecies and to determine their dates with an irreverent spirit; but he will study them more historically and intelligently by a faithful recognition of the methods of scientific research.

New life and interest.

The great gain resulting from this historical method is seen in the light it throws upon the nature of prophecy. Many current and popular notions of prophecy savor more of heathen divination, soothsaying, and necromancy than of the word of God. A morbid fancy is much more taken by the incantations of a witch of Endor than by the entire life and ministry of the prophet Samuel. But a thor-

Light on the nature of prophecy.

ough study of the prophetic books of the Old Testament, and especially the Book of Isaiah, will correct this erroneous idea of prophecy. It will be seen that genuine prophecy is a word or message of God through a human soul to a particular person or people. It may be a word of rebuke, of warning, or of consolation. But the prophet through whom the message is uttered always speaks primarily and especially for the benefit of his own contemporaries. Even when he utters a prediction the word is designed for those to whom he speaks rather than for future generations. His message is therefore supposed to bear some evidence of the times in which he lived, and it is usually luminous or obscure to subsequent readers just in proportion to their acquaintance with the circumstances which furnished the occasion of its first utterance.

Hence it must be apparent that a critical analysis of the Book of Isaiah which reveals its real structure, and the diverse periods of its several compositions, involves no loss at all, but is, on the contrary, most helpful to a proper understanding of the word of God.

THE BOOK OF ZECHARIAH.

Isaiah is not the only book which bears internal evidence of being a compilation or library of different prophecies attached to one great name. We have already noticed that even in the Book of Jeremiah the last chapter is confessedly a supplement. The last two chapters of Micah have also been questioned by a number of critics, and

Other examples of compilation and supplement.

thought to be capable of a more simple and natural explanation on the hypothesis of a later date than the age of Hezekiah. But the Book of Zechariah is more notably like that of Isaiah in that the last six chapters (ix-xiv) have been as widely and generally held to be of different authorship from the first eight as the last twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah have been held to be the production of another than Isaiah.

The first eight chapters of Zechariah are a body of prophecies remarkably unique. The first six are composed of visions and oracles closely related to each other, all having direct reference to the rebuilding of the temple after the exile, and designed for the encouragement of Joshua and Zerubbabel and their contemporaries. The great influence of the two prophets Haggai and Zechariah in helping forward the building of the house of God is acknowledged in Ezra v, 1, and vi, 14. Haggai's first oracle (Hag. i, 1) is dated two months earlier than the first date mentioned in Zechariah (i, 1), and all the visions of the last-named prophet are dated (i, 7) two months later than the latest date given in Haggai (ii, 10). The oracles of Haggai may thus have prepared the way for the visions of Zechariah, and helped to intensify the expectations which they must have excited. The eight successive visions of Zech. i, 7-vi, 8, and the symbolical crowning of the high priest Joshua (vi, 9-15) are a most interesting series of prophecies, and, like the answer to Elisha's prayer (in 2 Kings vi, 17), opened the eyes of the Jewish people to the invis-

Zech. i-viii.

ible hosts of Jehovah, which are more and mightier than all the hostile forces of the world. The seventh and eighth chapters contain additional words of Jehovah through Zechariah given two years later than the date of his visions, and teach important lessons on the relative value of fasting and works of righteousness. There is not and never has been any doubt as to the authorship of these first eight chapters, for their contents and scope, their numerous personal and historical allusions, and their points of contact with the words of Haggai put their date and origin beyond question.

But the last six chapters of this Book of Zechariah present one of the most difficult problems of Old Testament criticism. There is very general agreement that they are not from the same hand that wrote the visions and counsels of the first eight chapters, but there is disagreement as to the unity and date. A quotation from chap. xi, 12, 13, is ascribed in Matt. xxvii, 9, to Jeremiah the prophet, and as long ago as the middle of the seventeenth century such divines as Mede and Hammond maintained that these chapters were a lost or misplaced part of the prophecies of Jeremiah. In more recent times the prevailing opinion has been that these chapters are the work of two different authors, the one (author of ix-xi) a contemporary of Isaiah and perhaps identical with the Zechariah named in Isa. viii, 2, while the other (author of xii-xiv) wrote after the days of Josiah, and was probably a contemporary of Jeremiah. So these last parts of Zechariah have all been assigned a

Zech. ix-xiv.

preexilic date. A more recent hypothesis, however, is that the entire section (ix-xiv) in its present form belongs to postexilic times, and long after the days of Zechariah, when the Greek-Macedonian power had come into prominence; but even in this case it is supposed that chapters ix-xi are an older prophecy revised and modified in some particulars to adapt them to the later period.

Into the details of these discussions our space and plan do not permit us to enter. The one fact we seek to present clearly is that, while the internal evidence seems to point in part to times before the exile, and in part to postexilic times, modern critical opinion is nearly unanimous that Zech. ix-xiv has a different authorship from Zech. i-viii. The reasons for this opinion are many and various. There is a remarkable difference of language and style. The first part abounds in visions and symbols the like of which are utterly wanting in the second part. The allusion to the temple as yet standing (xi, 13) and to the two kingdoms of Judah and Israel (ix, 10; x, 6, 7; xi, 14) points most naturally to preexilic times, and the mention of Assyria in x, 10, would be strange in the lips of Zechariah. The idolatry mentioned in x, 2, and xiii, 2, did not exist in Judah after the exile, and the description of prophets and unclean spirits in xiii, 2-6, seems also irrelevant to the times of Zechariah and Haggai. On the other hand, the mention of Greece in ix, 13, and the presuppositions of exile in ix, 12, and x, 6-10, point apparently to postexilic times, and the pas-

The internal evidence diverse.

sage in ix, 1-8, has been thought to describe the march of Alexander's triumphs after the battle of Issus (B. C. 332). Hence the plausibility of the opinion that chapters ix-xi contain fragments of an old prophecy of the eighth century B. C. which have been appropriated and worked over by a postexilic writer.

Chapters xii-xiv have a distinct heading and contain a fourfold picture of Jehovah's preservation, judgment, and glorification of Jerusalem. The following analysis may assist the reader in grasping the contents and scope:

1. Jerusalem impregnable against all the peoples. xii, 1-9.
2. The Repentance and Mourning of Jerusalem. xii, 10-14.
3. The Purification of Jerusalem from Idolatry and false Prophecy. xiii, 1-6.[1]
4. The final Judgment and Glorification of Jerusalem. xiv, 1-21.

The wide and general range of this oracle makes it a remarkable parallel of Isa. xxiv-xxvii; for its figurative element is so marked, and its allusions are so indefinite, that we find it impossible to locate it with certainty and assign its exact historical occasion. It seems to transcend the limit of any one particular period of Jewish history. The prophecy fits in a general way the ideal given in Isa. xxix, 8, that "the multitude of all the nations that fight against Mount Zion" shall find their warfare as disappointing as a deceptive dream. For God has a great purpose of grace to accomplish by that people

Like Isa. xxiv-xxviii.

[1] I omit from this analysis xiii, 7-9, as a passage which has probably been misplaced, and which finds a more natural connection when transposed to the end of chapter xi.

whose name and interest are identified with Jerusalem; and hence the name "Israel" in the title (xii, 1) is virtually synonymous with "Judah and Jerusalem." The allusion to Josiah's lamentable death (in xii, 11) shows the prophecy to be later than B. C. 610, but not necessarily preexilic, and while the mention of idols and false prophets in xiii, 2-6, points most naturally to the preexilic period, it is not to be overlooked that sorcerers are mentioned in postexilic times by Malachi (iii, 5), and mercenary prophets were to be found in the days of Nehemiah (Neh. vi, 12-14). It is therefore apparent that a valuable piece of prophecy has come down to us, embodied in the Book of Zechariah, and yet so different from the acknowledged writings of that prophet as to convince one of its different authorship. But its exact date and authorship we may never be able to determine.

How two such distinguishable pieces of prophecy came to be attached to the work of Zechariah we cannot now explain, except by more or less plausible conjectures. The same problem presents itself in the Book of Isaiah. A full explanation would require a knowledge of all the editing and copying of these prophecies, and the principles which governed the Jewish scribes and doctors in their formation of the Hebrew canon. Who can now show us any sufficient reason for the editor of the Book of Jeremiah appending chapter lii to his prophecies? Or who can furnish anything more than a conjecture why the historical matter out of 2 Kings xviii-xx was re-

Conjectural reasons.

peated in Isa. xxxvi-xxxviii? It is not improbable that various artificial reasons governed in the compilation and arrangements of certain books. It may have been thought as suitable to combine a collection of great prophecies under the name of Isaiah, a prophet of the highest rank, as to connect the Psalms with the name of David and the Proverbs with Solomon. In fact, the Book of Isaiah may have been the first *collection* of prophecies among the Jews. Cheyne conjectures that "the extant literary records of the prophecies of Isaiah made up too small a work to be set by the side of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Had not the Book of Isaiah been considerably enlarged, its place must have been among the so-called minor prophets, like the Book of Hosea, which was placed among the lesser prophets simply on account of its brevity. Such a lot would not have been consonant with the dignified position in the state which tradition assigned to Isaiah."[1]

Book of Malachi anonymous.

The most plausible hypothesis for the additions to Zechariah is that which recognizes the Book of Malachi as one of three oracles of as many unknown prophets, the other two being Zech. ix-xi, and Zech. xii-xiv. The Minor Prophets are referred to in ancient Jewish writings as "the Twelve." It is supposed that the compiler and editor of these lesser prophecies arranged them so as to make twelve little books in one, and therefore attached two of the three anonymous prophecies to the work of Zechariah, and placed the third separately under the

[1] *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, p. xvii. London, 1895.

name of *Malachi,* which he supplied with the title from chapter iii, 1, where the Hebrew word translated "my messenger" is *malachi.* The editor may, indeed, have believed that the messenger there referred to was the prophet himself. We should observe, accordingly, that these three anonymous oracles at the close of the minor prophets all begin with the same formula, "Burden of the word of Jehovah" (comp. ix, 1; xii, 1; Mal. i, 1). It is to be remarked, further, that we have nowhere else in the Scriptures the trace or mention of a prophet of the name of Malachi, nor does the word elsewhere occur as a proper name. The Septuagint version, moreover, translates the title "Oracle of the word of the Lord *by the hand of his messenger;*" and the Targum says, "*By the hand of my messenger,* whose name is called Ezra the scribe."

In view of all these facts, illustrative of the compilation of various prophecies in one collection and under one name, the critical problems of the Books of Isaiah and Zechariah ought to be viewed as purely literary questions. No matter of doctrine or of faith is here involved. The divine lessons of these prophetic oracles remain the same, whatever we decide as to dates and authorship. But as we have shown above, the minute study required to locate a prophecy, and determine its occasion and purpose, adds a tenfold interest to these lively oracles. It enables us to transfer ourselves more vividly to the ancient time, and to obtain a truer view of the meaning of the prophets.

A question of literature, not of doctrine.

CHAPTER V.

PARABOLIC PROPHECY.

God spoke of old by visions and by dreams,
In many a precept and in varying forms;
What mortal mind can count the heavenly norms!
What man or angel name the mystic beams
Through which prophetic revelation streams!
As well might infant hands bind tropic storms.
Revealer of the things unseen, unheard,
What parables thou lovest to propound!
What riddles, what symbolic shapes abound
Upon the pictured pages of thy word!
What jewels scattered lavishly around,
O'er which even listless natures should be stirred!
Speak as thou wilt, by image, song, or dream,
Only give us to know the Heavenly Gleam.

CHAPTER V.

PARABOLIC PROPHECY.

THE Books of Jonah and Daniel are exceptional among all the canonical books of the Old Testament which have ever been classed among the prophets. They have, perhaps, attracted more attention, involved more controversy, and are to-day the subjects of more doubt and difficulty in biblical exposition than any other portions of the Bible. We treat them separately as peculiar types of prophetic teaching, and explain them as sacred oracles set in an idealistic background, after the manner of parable and allegory. We call them parabolic because of the pictorial form in which they enshrine the word of truth and revelation. Before proceeding to examine their peculiarities we do well to premise the question whether or no the difficulties supposed to attach to the explanation of these books do not arise mainly from *a priori* assumptions as to what literary form and character a prophetic book must have? It is quite common to hear and read assertions of "what inspiration requires," so that many seem to conclude that a fictitious narrative designed to teach and illustrate a moral lesson is incompatible with a worthy conception of the inspired word of the Lord. But it is written in Heb. i, 1, that God

Inspired epigrapha.

spoke through the prophets "by divers portions and in divers manners," and it should be an open question, to be determined by a rational appeal to facts, what *manner, form,* or *method* any one or more prophets have chosen for setting forth the heavenly messages.

Inspired fiction.

As a matter of fact, we do find, as portions of the Holy Scriptures, riddles, fables, enigmas, proverbs, odes, parables, allegories, and symbols. Is there anything preposterous in the thought of an inspired riddle or inspired irony? What are the parables of Jesus but inspired fictions—that is, imaginative narratives made up for the purpose of teaching a religious truth? The great moral novels of modern literature are but extended parables, and their aim is to inculcate a wholesome moral lesson by means of a fascinating story that is true to human life. No one would seriously insist that the parables of the good Samaritan, the prodigal son, or the unjust judge must be veritable statements of historic reality because spoken by the Lord. It is of the nature of a parable to keep its narrative in the realm of supposable reality; but fables and allegories and symbols make use of much that is essentially imaginative, and the visional Apocalypse portrays monstrosities like a beast with seven heads and ten horns. Whether, therefore, any prophet of God has made use of imaginative narrative in his teaching, and whether the canonical Scriptures contain a legend, a fable, a romance, or even an extravaganza, are questions of fact to be decided by faithful criticism and research. If found to be facts, it is then in order

to show how such forms of composition are in keeping with the purpose and methods of divine revelation, and are useful for instruction in righteousness.

THE BOOK OF JONAH.

In 2 Kings xiv, 25, we are told that Jeroboam II "restored the border of Israel from the entering in of Hamath unto the sea of the Arabah, according to the word of the Lord which he spake by the hand of his servant Jonah the son of Amittai, the prophet, who was of Gath-hepher." Aside from this statement there is no other reference to Jonah in the Old Testament, except what we find in the book which bears his name. Whether this book be a genuine production of the ancient prophet named in connection with Jeroboam, or whether it be the writing of a later prophet who assumed the name of Jonah, as the author of Ecclesiastes assumed the personality of "the son of David, king in Jerusalem,"—this is naturally the preliminary inquiry of scientific criticism.

Prophet from Gath-hepher.

1. The first thing to strike the attention of readers of the Book of Jonah is the peculiarly marvelous character of its narrative. One who has no prejudice whatever against the doctrine of the supernatural, and accepts other recorded miracles of the Bible without a question, may well hesitate before accepting all the statements of this book as matters of historical fact. He may not for a moment question the possibility of God's preparing a great fish to swallow one of his prophets, and of his preserving him three

Remarkable character of narrative.

days and nights in the belly of the fish, and then causing him to be vomited out upon the dry land. But if he be well read in the later Jewish literature he will bethink himself of many haggadic stories of similar character which were employed by famous rabbinical teachers to enhance and illustrate the ancient scriptures, and inculcate the lessons of God's providence. The Book of Tobit in the Apocrapha has its story of the fish which "leaped out of the river, and would have swallowed up the young man" (vi, 2). Ewald, who regards the Book of Jonah as a unique specimen of the best ancient Jewish Haggadoth, observes that "at a time when prophetism inevitably approached its decadence a great quantity of prophetic legends existed among the Hebrews, coming the more into the foreground in proportion as the public labors of the prophets became more a thing of the past. Many of the prophetic truths, which had formerly been uttered with energy, produced still such abiding effects that they also sought in the fresh revival and presentation of these legends to obtain complete utterance. Thus the last prophets themselves were able to be the inaugurators of this late aftergrowth of prophetic literature."[1] These facts and suggestions will have much weight with a student who examines the Book of Jonah unbiased by the *a priori* assumption that the Holy Spirit cannot make use of legendary material or of idealistic narrative as a means and method of prophetic teaching.

[1] *Commentary on the Prophets of the Old Testament*, English trans., vol. v, pp. 90, 91. London, 1881.

2. A number of incidental expressions occur in the book which imply a date long after Nineveh had fallen. A writer in the times of Jeroboam II would probably not have said, "Nineveh *was* a great city" (iii, 3). The title "king of Nineveh" (iii, 6) would hardly have been employed by a writer during the period of the existence of the Assyrian empire. The expression "the God of heaven" (i, 9) is common in Ezra, Nehemiah, and Daniel, but not in pre-exilic books. It is also most remarkable, and withal unaccountable, that the preaching of a Hebrew prophet, as early as B. C. 800, effected such a wholesale and complete conversion of the population of Nineveh as that recorded in Jonah iii, 6-9, and that not a single allusion to it should occur elsewhere in the Old Testament, or in any ancient history or inscription. And it is the extreme of improbability that any Assyrian monarch like those whose inscriptions speak to us from the monuments to-day should have received without hesitation or question such a message as Jonah's from one who was known to be no "servant of Asshur," but rather an enemy. Internal evidences of date.

3. Another set of evidences of the late origin of the book is found in its language and style which furnish in this case a very weighty argument. We find a considerable number of words and forms which the Semitic scholar recognizes at once as unmistakable marks of the postexilic period of the language. The psalm in chapter ii, which purports to be the prayer of Jonah out of the fish's belly, Language and style.

is made up mainly of extracts from various psalms[1] which express thanksgiving for deliverance past, not supplication for rescue out of present distress. It accordingly lacks that originality and definiteness which a genuine production of the eighth century B. C., composed for so extraordinary an occasion, would most naturally have borne.

Prevailing result of criticism.

The above considerations make up such a variety of cumulative evidence as to convince a large and constantly increasing number of readers that the book in question is not the work of the ancient prophet of Gath-hepher, but rather of one who wrote in the fifth century B. C. In view of the reasons presented at the beginning of this chapter, no devout student of the Bible should be unsettled or disturbed by such a finding. It is, as there shown, a question, not of doctrine, or of faith, but of fact, to be determined by valid proofs. And every faithful student of the word must judge for himself whether the proofs adduced are cogent and valid.

Counter arguments.

Volumes of apologetic literature have been written to show that the arguments presented above may be variously answered, and that all the statements of the Book of Jonah may be shown to have been "possible." Dr. Pusey, in his com-

[1] Jonah ii, 2 = Psa. xviii, 5, 6; cxx, 1.
3 = Psa. xviii, 4; xlii, 7.
4 = Psa. xxxi, 22.
5 = Psa. xviii, 4; lxix, 1, 2; cxvi, 3.
6 = Psa. xxx, 3, lxxxvi, 13.
7 = Psa. xviii, 6; cxlii, 2, 3.
8 = Psa. xxxi, 6.
9 = Psa. l, 14; cxvi, 17; iii, 8.

mentary on the Minor Prophets, cites numerous learned authorities to show that the "great fish" was not necessarily a whale, but a huge Mediterranean shark, and that specimens of these have been taken having mouth and throat of such vast size as easily to swallow a large man. He quotes Blumenbach as saying that "the white shark is found of the size of ten thousand pounds, and horses have been found whole in its stomach." But a thoughtful reader may well wonder why such expositors as Pusey should try to make out that it is *possible* for certain huge fish to swallow men. It would seem to go without saying that, if the narrative is historically and literally true, it is manifestly the record of a stupendous miracle. It is not the mere *possibility* of this or that kind of a great fish swallowing a man; it is the whole account of Jehovah preparing the great fish, and preserving Jonah alive in its belly for three days and three nights, and then "speaking unto the fish" to vomit Jonah out upon the land. All this taken together is of the nature of miracle of the most astonishing character, and it seems pitiably puerile for men to go about seeking sea monsters of a given size in order to prove the miracle in question possible! With God all things are possible.

The scoffer and the atheist may indulge in ridicule over "the story of the whale," but no devout theist will presume to deny the *possibility* of the miracle here supposed. There are, and probably always will be, some who will prefer the view that the narrative of the Book of Jonah is a record of

No question of possibility.

actual fact. Such persons need not be disturbed in the enjoyment of their own belief, if, indeed, it afford them any comfort. But they, on the other hand, ought not to denounce as infidels those who, while conceding the *possibility*, maintain the *improbability* of the things in question and prefer another explanation. With the evangelical theist it is no question of possibilities at all, and the current arguments in that line are irrelevant. The first and leading question is, *To what class of literature does the Book of Jonah belong?* This question once settled, there can be no controversy as to the teachings of the book.

Citation by Jesus.

The genuineness and historicalness of the book have been supposed to be virtually affirmed by Jesus in what he says about "the sign of Jonah" in Matt. xii, 39-41; xvi, 4; and Luke xi, 29-32. Here, however, the real question is, How far does such a use of Old Testament Scripture commit the one using it to an authoritative decision of the character of the book cited? Our answer is on this point (as on the quotations from "Isaiah the prophet," which were noticed in the previous chapter) that it was no part of the purpose of Jesus to affirm an opinion on such a question. No matter whether the Book of Jonah were veritable history or religious fiction, so long as the book was a well-known part of the Hebrew canon and accepted as Holy Scripture, it answered alike the purpose of rebuke and conviction. To insist that such a homiletic use of Scripture is the same as uttering a critical verdict on the origin and character of the lit-

erary composition would be as great an error as to insist that Jude's quotation from the pseudepigraphical Book of Enoch (Jude, verse 14) proves the genuineness of that work as coming from the ancient patriarch, "the seventh from Adam." The same may be said of the allusion to "Jannes and Jambres" in 2 Tim. iii, 8. These traditional *names* are of no more historic value than the rest of the same extra-biblical tradition, which, according to Eusebius, declared that these magicians were the first instructors of Moses, and afterward perished with the Egyptian army in the Red Sea. It is sufficient to say that, whether that tradition were true or not, it made no difference whatever with Paul. It was no concern of his to offer an opinion on the historicalness of the tradition, but simply to employ it for illustration. Aside from the *names,* the fact of the opposition of the Egyptian magicians is matter of record in Exod. vii, 11; but in the ninth verse of Jude reference is made to an apocryphal legend which has no scriptural warrant, and the story is obviously cited, not with the thought of affirming anything touching its real historical character, but for the purpose of illustration. It is therefore a vain and illogical procedure for one to maintain that such citations from any class of well-known writings are equivalent to an authoritative dictum on the genuineness of the book or of the tradition.

Like Jude's citation of Enoch.

Jannes and Jambres.

The body of Moses.

[1] On this question of the authority of quotations for settling a claim of authorship, see the Appendix to this volume.

It remains to indicate the purpose and lessons of the Book of Jonah. As a matter of fact, the narrative contributes nothing whatever to our knowledge of history. If its historical character be disallowed, its parabolic or allegorical lessons remain. Kleinert, in his commentary on Jonah in Lange's *Biblework,* points to Isaiah's parable of the vineyard (Isa. v, 1-7), and Ezekiel's figurative representations of Jerusalem and Judah and Samaria (Ezek. xvi and xxiii), as illustrations of prophetic allegory, a symbolizing of the past, present, or future of a great community in a single concrete form. In his view Jonah is the typical representative of Israel, and Nineveh of the heathen world. That great heathen city is selected "because the contact with Nineveh marks the decisive turning point between the old time, when Israel, joyful in his strength, subjected the neighboring nations, and the new time, in which prophecy, through contact with the Mesopotamian powers, became of a universal character." But Israel does not appreciate his mission to the heathen world, and turns away to the ships and traffic of the world of gain. He sleeps in storm and danger while the heathen are praying, each man to his god. Then he is thrown into the deep and swallowed by a huge sea monster—symbol of the secular power appointed by God for the scourge of disobedient Israel (comp. Isa. xxvii, 1). Shut up in exile, Israel again seeks Jehovah. The three days and nights are an ideal period allotted as in Hos. vi, 1, 2, for the punishment of Israel.

Lessons of the book.

Kleinert's allegorical exposition.

At their close the dragon of the sea casts forth the prophet, and the exile comes to an end. But Israel's call to prophesy to the heathen world is then renewed a second time, and, contrary to his own notions, he finds that Jehovah his God is full of mercy and compassion, and shows wonderful kindness to the entire heathen world that repents and cries mightily unto God.

Thus the Book of Jonah is made an allegory of Israel's divine call, disobedience, punishment, restoration, and subsequent ministry. Many find in this exposition the most satisfactory solution of the narrative which makes up the substance of the book.[1] And it is well to mention, in this connection, the fact that there have been numerous expositors who have adopted a similar allegorical interpretation of several parables of Jesus. The prodigal son has been explained as the Gentile world in apostasy from the everlasting Father, who, upon the return and penitence of the wanderers, welcomes them home again to the blessings of the covenant. But the elder son is the narrow, grudging, self-righteous Jews, who would exclude the Gentiles from all participation in their own inheritance. So, too, the rich man and Lazarus have been explained as representing the past and future relations of Jew and Gentile. The worldly-minded, sumptuous, self-satisfied Pharisee reveled in his superabundance of good things, and shared contemptuously with the poor Gentile at his door. But in the new dispensa-

Allegorical parables.

[1] The reader may find an extensive discussion of the Book of Jonah, together with an allegorical interpretation of it, by Charles Henry Hamilton Wright, in his *Biblical Essays*, pp. 34-98. Edinburgh, 1886.

tion the wretched outcasts are carried into Abraham's bosom (comp. Luke xiii, 29; Matt. viii, 11, 12), while the Jews are rejected and find themselves in miserable plight. The parable of the good Samaritan has received a still more minute allegorizing. The man going down to Jericho is the human race, which has left the presence and peace of God in paradise and turned downward toward the city of the curse (Josh. vi, 26). He has fallen into robbers' hands, and is stripped, and beaten, and left half dead. The law and sacrifices could not purge the conscience and remove the guilt and wounds of sin; and so, like the priest and Levite, they passed by. But Christ, the good Samaritan, had compassion, came and dressed the bruises of fallen man, took the form of a servant, and ministered to the helpless. The inn is the church, and the two pence are the gracious provision by the Lord of two abiding sacraments till he come again and restore all things perfectly.

More general interpretation.

But for the same reasons that have led the majority of interpreters to prefer a more general exposition and application of these parables we may prefer a more general interpretation of the Book of Jonah. As a prophetic parable it may be accepted as keeping its narrative within the limits of supposable reality, and yet, like Nathan's parable in 2 Sam. xii, 1-4, and all other parables, the narrative itself was not intended to be understood as describing actual events. The lessons which the author aimed to inculcate, and which can hardly fail to be recognized on any theory of the book, are the following:

1. The imperativeness of the prophetic call, and the impossibility of successful escape from any such divine commission. Vainly will any man or people presume to flee from the presence of Jehovah. No small portion of the one hundred and thirty-ninth psalm is an amplification of this thought, especially verses 3-10:

> Thou searchest out my path and my lying down,
> And art acquainted with all my ways.
> Thou hast beset me behind and before,
> And laid thine hand upon me.
> Such knowledge is too wonderful for me;
> It is high, I cannot attain unto it.
> Whither shall I go from thy Spirit?
> Or whither shall I flee from thy presence?
> If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there:
> If I make my bed in Sheol, behold, thou art there.
> If I take the wings of the morning,
> And dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea;
> Even there shall thy hand lead me,
> And thy right hand shall hold me.

2. Another important lesson is the religious nature of man and the sense of dependence upon God among all the nations. The heathen mariners "cried every man unto his god," and the Ninevites with one accord showed their belief in God and their readiness to humble themselves before him. The picture of the heathen world here given is an Old Testament revelation of what the apostle Peter was, like Jonah, slow to believe, that "in every nation he that feareth God, and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to him" (Acts x. 35).

3. This book furnishes a striking illustration of the *conditionality* of God's word concerning nations. The statement of Jer. xviii, 7-10, is thus confirmed: "At

what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up and to break down and to destroy it; if that nation, concerning which I have spoken, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them. And at what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it; if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good, wherewith I said I would benefit them."

4. The necessity of repentance and obedience in order to receive the forgiving favor of God is enhanced by being set over in contrast with the disobedience of the willful prophet. The true fear of God is the indispensable basis of all fruitful piety.

5. The conclusion of the book (and, in fact, its principal lesson is presented in the fourth and last chapter) is a conspicuous condemnation of the narrow bigotry of Judaism as represented in the murmuring anger of Jonah, and the exhibition of the tender compassion of Jehovah, which delights to spare "that great city, wherein are more than sixscore thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left; and also much cattle." In illustration of the catholicity of God's love, Jonah is the most advanced book in the Old Testament, and nearest to the gospel of Paul. It is worthy of note that Keil, who holds to the historicalness of all that is written in this book, observes that "the mission of Jonah was a fact of symbolical and typical importance, which was intended not only to enlighten Israel

Most catholic of Old Testament books.

as to the position of the Gentile world in relation to the kingdom of God, but also to typify the future adoption of such of the heathen as should observe the word of God into the fellowship of the salvation prepared in Israel for all nations."

6. The homiletical and illustrative use which our Lord made of "the sign of Jonah" (Matt. xii, 40; Luke xi, 30)[1] is a permanent testimony to the religious value of this remarkable book. Both in the analogy of his "three days and three nights in the belly of the whale," and the results of his preaching to the men of Nineveh, Jonah was a sign to the generation of Jesus. As in many another Old Testament sign which found a typical application in the New Testament, the sign of Jonah furnishes more points of contrast than of strict analogy. Jonah was an unwilling messenger, and his hearers were a heathen people and an alien nation. But Jesus came lovingly to do the will of God; he came unto his own, and his own received him not. But more wonderful than all else that is typified by the sign of Jonah is the resurrection and ascension of the Christ after his "three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." For, as Paul avers in Eph. iv, 9: In saying that he ascended, "what is it but

Homiletic use.

[1] The reader ought, perhaps, to be advised that the "sign of Jonah," as explained in Matt. xii, 40, has no such explanation in the two other places where it is mentioned (Matt. xvi, 4; Luke xi, 30). In Luke it is said that Jonah himself became a sign to the Ninevites, and no allusion is made to the three days and nights in the whale. If Jesus really said what is written only in Matt. xii, 40, it seems unaccountable that Luke should have failed to insert the words. Hence not a few critics believe the text of Matt. xii, 40, to be an interpolation and not the words of Jesus.

that he also descended into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended far above all the heavens, that he might fill all things;" and he has shown us more fully than any Old Testament writer that God is not the God of the Jews only, but of the Gentiles also (Rom. iii, 29).

THE BOOK OF DANIEL.

Daniel not in prophetic canon.

In the arrangement of books in the Hebrew canon Daniel is not reckoned among the prophets, but is placed in the Hagiographa, between the Books of Esther and Ezra. He seems to have been regarded as a famous sage, a revealer of secrets, rather than a prophet, and the book which bears his name is altogether unique in the Old Testament literature. It is one half narrative and the other half apocalyptic, for its prophetic elements are cast in the form of visions and angelic revelations; and so they differ from the direct oracles or words of Jehovah which the less visional prophets were wont to speak. The narrative portion resembles the haggadic legends so common in the later Jewish literature and already mentioned in connection with the Book of Jonah. The story of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, and their deliverance from the fiery furnace (chap. iii), and that of Daniel's deliverance from the den of lions (chap. vi), are among the most familiar portions of the Bible, and are cited in Heb. xi, 33, 34, as illustrations of the triumphs of faith.

The literary problems of the Book of Daniel are

most perplexing to all classes of critics and biblical scholars. The oldest text is written partly in Hebrew and partly in Aramaic, but the reason for the use of these two cognate languages (or dialects) is not apparent. The Aramaic section (ii, 4-vii, 28) forms no distinct or natural division of the work. Some have thought that the original Hebrew text of this section has been lost, and an ancient Targum, or paraphrase, has been substituted in its place—a not improbable hypothesis. The oldest version of the book contains haggadic additions both to the Hebrew and Aramaic portions, and the additions appear to be translations of a Hebrew or Aramaic original. The Septuagint, or ancient Alexandrian version, is very faulty, and that of Theodotion was for a long time substituted for it in current copies. Both these Greek versions insert, at chap. iii, 23, the song of the three Hebrews in the fiery furnace, and the Alexandrian appends to the book the stories of Susanna and Bel and the Dragon, which are printed separately in the Old Testament Apocrypha. Theodotion's version places Susanna at the beginning and Bel and the Dragon at the end of the Book of Daniel. All these facts tend to beget a feeling that the original text of Daniel is no longer extant, and in its place we have a compilation which probably contains some haggadic elements which were not a part of the work as it left the hand of its Hebrew author. But the very fact that the text of this book is in so uncertain a condition ought to admonish all intelligent students that the purpose and

The literary problems.

value of the Scriptures are not to be nullified by the accidents of corrupted copies and translations. It is safe to say that no transcript or version of any of the canonical books ever made is so defective or erroneous as to hide the great lessons of righteousness which it is the primary purpose of the Holy Scriptures to impart.

The question of the genuineness of Daniel is an old and almost threadbare controversy. It can never be even approximately settled by disputants who come to the study and discussion of it biased with *a priori* opinions which virtually foreclose all argument. How is it possible for anyone to form an impartial judgment of the points at issue when he has already pronounced finally on the major premise, namely, that *no inspired scripture can have been written in the forms of fiction?* The word "fiction," in this connection, ought to have no unfavorable implication, any more than allegory, or parable, which we have shown at the beginning of this chapter to be essentially fictitious in construction. One may well ask why we may not have real prophecy as well as the highest teachings of philosophy set in a fictitious background? Inspired men of God have chosen fable, and riddle, and allegory, and parable, and symbol as vehicles of revelation. Why should it be deemed incredible that they should appropriate to the purposes of divine revelation any forms of human composition which have a recognized place in the standard literatures of cultivated nations?

Question complicated by *a priori* assumptions.

There are now, and probably will be for a long time

to come, many who accept the Book of Daniel as a genuine product of the times of the Babylonian exile. The book clearly purports to have such an origin, even as Ecclesiastes purports to come from Solomon, and the Book of Enoch from the ancient patriarch who "walked with God three hundred years." But the fact that a book has been received into the Old Testament is in itself no conclusive evidence as to the real nature of its composition. The historicalness of the contents of Daniel is no more proven by its place in the canon than the unhistoricalness of Enoch is proven by its absence from the canon. But, as in all other instances of disputed authorship and date, we may allow the current traditional opinion of a book to stand until sufficient evidence of its error is brought forward to compel a change of view. The main reasons which have led a constantly increasing number of biblical scholars to doubt the genuineness of the Book of Daniel are the following:

1. Its position in the Hagiographa, between Esther and Ezra, favors the view that it originated after the second or prophetical section of the Jewish canon was closed.

2. There is no allusion to Daniel or clear evidence of any knowledge of his book in the postexilic prophets, or in Ezra and Nehemiah.

3. In Ecclesiasticus xlviii, 22-25, and xlix, 7-10, all the other prophets are mentioned, but no reference to Daniel. Ezra is also omitted from that list of worthies.

4. There is a use of the word *Chaldeans* in Dan. ii,

2; iv, 7, etc., in a sense which Schrader says "is unknown to the Assyrian-Babylonian language, and formed itself after the end of the Babylonian empire."

5. While the monuments show that Nabonidus, the last king of Babylon, had a son Belsharusur, there is no clear evidence that he ever reigned as king, and the mention of Nebuchadnezzar as his father in chapter v, 11, has more the appearance of embellished tradition than of historical fact.

6. The reign of Darius the Mede after the fall of Babylon, and before the accession of Cyrus, is without any clear confirmation in history.

7. The driving forth of Nebuchadnezzar from men, and his eating grass like oxen, till his hair became like eagles' and his nails like birds' (iv, 33), is more of the nature of haggadic legend than of veritable history.

8. The remarkable number of Persian and Greek words which are found in the book, amounting to more than twenty in all, is a fact most difficult if not impossible to reconcile with the traditional theory of date and authorship.

9. The doctrines concerning angels, the resurrection, and the Messianic reign have been thought to indicate a later period than that of Daniel's abode in Babylon.

10. Finally, the detailed prophecy of chapter xi is so specific in narrating minute affairs of the Maccabean times and of the wars of the Greek, Syrian, and Egyptian kings as to beget the conviction that it is not a prediction made in the days of Cyrus the Persian, but an idealistic prophecy written for the purpose of consola-

tion and encouragement during the persecutions of the Jews by Antiochus Epiphanes (about B. C. 167). For the career of this impious king is not only made most prominent by the symbols of the "little horn" in chapters vii and viii, and perhaps by the desolator in ix, 26, 27, but it is minutely outlined in xi, 21-45, and brought down to the time of his death (which event seems to be described in verses 40-45 in mystic apocalyptic form), after which (chap. xii, 1-4) the Messianic time is depicted as immediately following.

These ten reasons are by no means exhaustive of all that has been alleged against the genuineness of the Book of Daniel, but they are sufficient to show a very strong ground for the belief that the book was written long after the time of "Cyrus the Persian." Altogether they form an argument which would be accepted as decisive with any other piece of literature, as, for example, the Book of Enoch, or the Sibylline Oracles. If anyone will take the pains to go through the elaborate answers which have been written to these reasons, he will find that the most they make out is the *possibility* of the date and authorship which tradition has assigned. The reasons stated above are not absolutely demonstrative, and each one may be offset by counter considerations. The issue of reverent biblical criticism is not the question of possibility, and it is therefore irrelevant and futile for defenders of the genuineness of Daniel to go to pains to show that all the statements of the book are possibly true and historical. Such showing of possibilities determines nothing

General result.

in this case more than in the Book of Jonah. Nor does it help the cause of truth to assume to disparage any of the reasons given above by saying that "they are as old as Porphyry," the pagan philosopher. Even a pagan philosopher may be a thorough scholar and a clear and incisive critic, as Porphyry unquestionably was. The late Dean Stanley observed (*Jewish Church,* vol. iii, p. 78) that when men say that these are merely Porphyry's old objections reappearing it is well to rejoin in the words of a venerable scholar and divine, "They have always reappeared because they have never been answered."

The most convincing argument for the late date of the book is the fact that all the prophecies culminate in the great persecutor Antiochus Epiphanes. One who studies these prophecies in the light of other prophetic scriptures may well wonder at the singularity of their coming through a prophet in Babylon some four hundred years before the events so minutely described. Samuel, Hosea, Isaiah, Amos, Jeremiah, and the other prophets exhibit nothing of this kind. Their messages have an obvious relevancy, encouragement, or admonition for the people of their own time. Except in their various concepts of the Messianic reign, which are always ideal and peculiar, their words are a living voice to their own generation, and their predictions concern only the immediate future. But here is a series of prophecies which reach their climax of catastrophe in the overthrow of the notorious king whom the first Book of Maccabees (i, 10) calls

The leading argument.

"a sinful root, Antiochus Epiphanes." After having described him quite fully at least twice before (vii, 8, 24, 25; viii, 9-12, 23-25) our author in chapter xi, 21-45, gives a fourfold outline of Antiochus's career. In verses 21-24 he introduces him as a "contemptible person," who obtains the kingdom by flatteries, and acts deceitfully. In verses 25-28 he outlines his successful campaigns against Egypt, or "the king of the south," and in 29-39 describes his unsuccessful invasion of Egypt, his profanation of the Jewish temple, the struggles of the Maccabees against him, and his desperate character as a lawless man of sin. In 40-45 we have what seems to be an apocalyptic picture of the final mad efforts of this vile enemy of the Jewish people against "the glorious holy mountain," and his utter overthrow. At that time, we are told (xii, 1-3), Israel's great prince Michael (symbolic name for the Messiah) shall arise and deliver his people, "every one that shall be found written in the book." The deliverance involves a resurrection and everlasting life of unspeakable glory.

Now, the question of criticism in reference to these prophecies is not about the *possibility* of their utterance in the time of Cyrus (or, if one please, in the time of Abraham or of Moses); the wisdom and power of God are surely sufficient for any such requirements of foreknowledge. The controlling question is, Why should Daniel in Babylon or in Shushan represent the Messianic kingdom, and the final triumph of "the people of the saints of the Most High," as coming immediately after the fall of Anti-

Not a question of possibility.

ochus Epiphanes? Some interpreters have held that the "little horn" of chapter vii is a different person from the "little horn" of chapter viii; but no exegete of any note has ever attempted to deny that Dan. xi, 21-45, is a detailed portraiture of Antiochus Epiphanes. Why, now, should a prophet of B. C. 534 portray this Syrian king as living "at the time of the end"? And how can we explain the coming of the Messiah, the resurrection and the glorification of God's people, as taking place "at that time"?

If, however, the author of this book were a Jew living at the time of the persecution under Antiochus Epiphanes, such a portraiture of "the time of the end" and this entire description of the four great kingdoms are capable of an easy and natural explanation. From this point of view the entire series of predictions in the book may be seen to accord with the analogy of Messianic prophecy. In Isa. iv, 2-6, a glorious Messianic picture is made to follow "in that day" when God shall execute his fierce judgments upon the house of Jacob and the daughters of Zion. In chapter viii, 5-ix, 7, the Davidic Prince of Peace succeeds "the king of Assyria and all his glory" who sweeps into Judah and overflows and fills the breadth of Immanuel's land. And so again, in chapter xi of the same book, the Messianic "shoot out of the stock of Jesse" comes forth immediately after the overthrow of the Assyrian invader, whose fearful march is described in the preceding chapter. In like manner Ezekiel connects the last great battle of the hosts of Gog out of the uttermost

Analogies of prophecy.

parts of the north with the restoration of Israel from the exile. They all perish, like Antiochus, "upon the mountains of Israel," and thus all the nations are made to know that Jehovah caused his people to "go into captivity among the nations, and gathered them into their own land." And then follows the ideal visional picture of the new temple and the new land (Ezek. xxxviii-xlviii). Joel also draws a similar picture of Israel's final glory as issuing "in that day" when Jehovah brings again the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem, and overthrows the hostile nations "in the valley of decision" (Joel iii). In all these prophecies, and also in others, we find in the message and its manner of utterance a natural relevancy to the needs of the time of the prophet. From which it is proper to infer that God raises up prophets for the special demands of the times to which they belong, and their oracles are found to have obvious reference to the persons and events of the time. Messianic prophecy in particular takes for its occasion the wrongs and discouragements of the hour, and is wont to soar above the evils of the prophet's time, and idealize a coming age in which all those wrongs should be abolished. So the day of the Lord is "near at hand," and represented as coming directly after the visitation of judgment shall fall upon the enemy and oppressor. Accordingly, as we have shown, Isaiah connects Israel's glorification through the Messiah directly with the fall of Assyria, and Daniel connects it with the fall of Antiochus. It is inexplicably strange that Daniel, if prophesying in the time of Bab-

ylonian exile, has nothing to tell the "children of his people" about restoration from the captivity, unless it be the obscure oracle of ix, 24-27. He has not a word either of comfort or of admonition for his contemporaries. How utterly unlike Ezekiel in this respect! How different from the whole tone and cast of the prophecies of Isa. xl-lxvi, which have their standpoint at the time when Cyrus is marching from the east (xli, 25) and is soon to say of Jerusalem that she shall be built and that the foundation of the temple shall be laid (xliv, 28)!

All these considerations have the greater weight when we observe the scope of Daniel's prophecies. They are five in number, but are remarkable for going over and over again the same general outline. The first is given in the form of a dream of King Nebuchadnezzar, and under the symbol of a great image four great kingdoms, of which Nebuchadnezzar's was the first, are seen to be broken in pieces and to give place to the kingdom of the God of heaven (ii, 31-45). The second (chap. vii) is a vision of four great beasts which represent the same four kingdoms, and give way to the "kingdom of the saints of the Most High." The third (chap. viii) is seen "in Shushan the castle, which is in the province of Elam." This indicates a later period when this fortress city was the capital of the Persian empire (comp. Esth. i, 5), and the two kingdoms symbolized by the ram and the he-goat are the Medo-Persian and the Grecian (verses 20, 21). As the "little horn" of verses 9-12 and 23-25 corresponds with that of vii, 8, 24, 25, it becomes obvious

Scope of Daniel's prophecies.

that the two kingdoms of this third vision are the same as the third and fourth kingdoms of the preceding visions. The fourth prophecy (ix, 24-27) is brief and obscure, but the troublous times depicted, and the abominable desolation of city and sanctuary, point most naturally to the same disasters which are attributed to the little horn in viii, 9-14. The fifth and last prophecy, as we have seen, gives a minute description of ten Syrian and Egyptian kings down to the overthrow of Antiochus Epiphanes, and issues like all the others in an ideal of glorious triumph for the people of God.

Now, we are bold to say that, whatever may be the ultimate results of scientific criticism touching the date and authorship of the Book of Daniel, these prophetic portions constitute a most original and important body of divine revelation. Whether written during the exile, or in the days of the Maccabees, they contain a picture of the kingdoms of the world and their final subjection to the kingdom of God worthy to rank with any prophecies to be found in the Hebrew Scriptures. Nowhere else do we find, before the advent of Christ, such a magnificent conception of the kingdom of heaven. Here for the first time we meet with the vivid portraiture of successive world empires. They rise and pass away in the visions of the seer like so many huge monsters; but they are all under the dominion of the God of heaven, and are destined to give place, in the end, to the "kingdom of the saints of the Most High." Remarkable revelation.

We enter here into no detailed exposition of these

prophecies.[1] We simply observe that a self-consistent exposition must find the four great kingdoms between Nebuchadnezzar and Antiochus Epiphanes, and according to the great majority of the best modern interpreters they are the Babylonian, Median, Persian, and Grecian. The opinion that the fourth kingdom must be the Roman empire is based upon erroneous notions of prophecy, and the idea that Rome was too important a world power to be left out of such a prophecy. On such principles Great Britain, the United States, Russia, and China might claim representation in Hebrew prophecy. But, whatever history says or fails to say in confirmation, the Book of Daniel unquestionably places between the fall of "Belshazzar the Chaldean king" and "the reign of Cyrus the Persian" the reign of "Darius the Mede," who is of sufficient importance and authority to issue proclamations "unto all the peoples, nations, and languages that dwell in all the earth" (vi, 25), thus assuming a jurisdiction equal to that of Nebuchadnezzar, the Chaldean (iv, 1). The ten kings of the fourth kingdom (vii, 24) are not ten petty states of modern Europe, as many have vainly sought to show, but the ten contending princes, five Syrian and five Egyptian, but all of Greek origin, which are referred to in the eleventh chapter.[2] From one

Main outline of exposition.

[1] The reader is referred for fuller exposition of these most interesting prophecies to the little volume entitled *The Prophecies of Daniel Expounded*, by Milton S. Terry. New York and Cincinnati, 1893.

[2] In xi, 4-20, we have a rapid sketch of Alexander's successors in Syria and Egypt. No attempt is made to give an exhaustive history, but ten are distinguished so clearly that there has been no considerable diversity of opinion among exegetes in identifying them. The five Syrian or Seleucid kings are Seleucus Nicator (verse 5), Antiochus

visional point of view the seer beholds Antiochus Epiphanes, "the little horn," springing up from and after these ten kings; from another point of vision he is seen to spring out of one of four notable divisions of Alexander's world-wide empire, which, according to the prophet, was "broken and divided toward the four winds of heaven" (viii, 8; xi, 4).

Idealistic composition.

It remains now to say that, if we find that the Book of Daniel is a composition of the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, its narrative portions are to be explained as the idealistic background which the inspired genius of the author chose for his purpose. We need not dispute that Daniel was as truly an historical character as Jonah, the son of Amittai; that he lived and acquired great influence in the court of Nebuchadnezzar, and survived unto the reign of Cyrus the Persian. His reputation for abstinence, and piety, and the interpretation of dreams made him a most suitable character for a later writer to impersonate. But just how far the narrative portions of the book are truly historical we have not the means of proving. The great purpose and value of it, as we have shown, are not affected by our inability to determine that ques-

---

Theos (6), Seleucus Callinicus (7, 9), Antiochus the Great (10-19), and Seleucus Philopator (20). The five corresponding contemporary Egyptian or Ptolemaic kings are Ptolemy Soter (verse 5), Ptolemy Philadelphus (6), Ptolemy Energetes (7-9), Ptolemy Philopator (11), Ptolemy Epiphanes (17). The "three kings" which were displaced or put down by the accession of Antiochus Epiphanes were his elder brother Seleucus Philopator, who was assassinated; his nephew Demetrius, son of Seleucus Philopator and rightful heir to the throne; and his nephew Ptolemy Philometer, who had as good a claim to the throne of Syria as himself. Comp. 1 Macc. xi, 13.

tion. Whether the narratives of the fiery furnace and the den of lions be allegorical, parabolic, or historical, they have ever cultivated the true martyr spirit, and have served to comfort and encourage thousands who have been tested by fire and thrown to the wild beasts. As the great lessons of all religious allegories and parables remain the same, whether their narrative be esteemed as fact or fiction, so we believe all the great lessons of such prophetic books as Daniel and Jonah remain in full force, even if we admit that they are cast in idealistic literary form. The Apocalypse of Daniel, more than any other book of the Old Testament, has exerted a modeling influence upon that large body of later apocryphal Jewish literature which has copied its idealistic qualities. We have the Books of Enoch and Second Esdras (often called Fourth Ezra and the Apocalypse of Ezra), the Apocalypses of Moses and Baruch, the Testament of Abraham, and the Jewish Sibylline Oracles. The New Testament Revelation of John is largely patterned after the formal elements of the visions of Daniel. These facts show how immensely popular this class of literature came to be in the later Jewish and early Christian times. It may be safely said that, while these numerous apocryphal revelations are later and inferior to the Book of Daniel, one is scarcely competent to form a final judgment on the genuineness of Daniel without having first given careful study to the Jewish books which were modeled after it.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS.

We have now taken a survey of the books which represent Moses and the Prophets. Our aim has been to furnish the reader with a fair and reverent statement of the methods of modern biblical criticism, and the results which have been reached by the leading Hebrew scholars of our time. It seems exceedingly unfair, and must be prejudicial to the cause of truth, for the Church or its chief ministers to withhold these things from the knowledge of the people, who are exhorted to study the Bible. Scores of books have been published in denunciation of what is called "higher criticism," but one looks through them all in vain to find a full and fair expression of the reasons which this criticism offers for its conclusions. There is, on the contrary, an obvious effort on the part of many to make the words *critic* and *criticism* odious in the popular mind. Hence not a few among us have been made to believe that biblical criticism is an enemy of the evangelical faith, a pernicious disturber of the peace of Christendom. Criticism is denounced as a "picking flaws in the Bible," a hostile finding fault with what the sacred writers have said, and, withal, a carping and captious attitude toward the revelation of God in the Scriptures.

Fair statement of reasons.

We have a modest hope that the foregoing pages on "Moses and the Prophets" may contribute a little toward the refutation of such hasty judgments. We can well understand how persons who are governed in

their thinking by certain dogmatic prepossessions, and have made no thorough study of the critical discussions of the last century, may imagine that the positions taken in these pages are of dangerous tendency. You have robbed Moses of his rights, they say. You set aside the cherished beliefs of twenty-five centuries. You cast doubt upon some of the most familiar narratives of the Old Testament. You make the Book of Isaiah a compilation of fragments, the Book of Jonah an allegory, and a large part of the prophecies of Daniel a production written after the events which they assume to foretell. To all which, and much more of the same sort, we solemnly protest in the name of the Lord, and affirm that our method and aim throughout are to vindicate Moses; to see that he be not burdened with a load which hundreds of his truest admirers have long seen that he is not able to bear. We study to set all the narratives of the Hebrew Scripture in their true light, and to rid them of false glimmerings which have ever afforded the skeptic too much occasion for his hostility. It is no more disparagement to Isaiah to show that many anonymous prophecies have been associated with his name than it is a damage to David and to Solomon that many psalms and proverbs of unknown origin have been credited to them. And as for the Books of Jonah and Daniel, no gain can ever come to the word of God or the interests of truth by ignoring the findings of historical research. If in the face of such facts as present themselves to the critical scholar in these books and in that of Ecclesiastes

Hasty judgments.

one persists in the dogma that it is impossible that God should ever have inspired the writing of a pseudograph or have seen fit to have a part of the biblical revelation cast in that popular literary form, he may be allowed the privilege of enjoying his own opinion; but he violates a fundamental principle of Protestant Christianity when he attempts to make his dogma an article of faith for others.

We claim that the tendency and results of reverent criticism of the Scriptures are adapted to cultivate a deeper, richer, truer appreciation of the revelation of God in Jesus Christ. In behalf of this claim we affirm the following, not only as so many propositions, but as plain statements of fact:

Value of criticism.

1. The criticism of the original texts of the Bible (the so-called "lower criticism") has given us through the multiplied labors of the last hundred years a purer Bible than we had before. It has cut off some passages which we dearly cherished, such as the doxology of the Lord's Prayer in Matt. vi, 13; the story of the angel that troubled the waters in John v, 4; and that of the woman taken in adultery in John viii, 1-11; the last twelve verses of the Gospel of Mark, and the great proof text of the trinity in 1 John v, 7. But in spite of all such apparent losses we ought the rather to thank God for the painstaking research that clears the text of the interpolations of transcribers. No lover of the word of God should be anxious to keep in the Bible anything which was not originally there.

Textual criticism.

2. A clear understanding of the work of higher criticism will only show that its sole aim is to lay hold of the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. If Solomon were not the author of Ecclesiastes, it is only propagating falsehood to persist in declaring that he wrote it. Neither that book, nor the Pentateuch, nor the Prophets, nor the Psalms depend for their worth or usefulness on questions of authorship and date. The Epistle to the Hebrews is not worth one whit more for instruction in righteousness by insisting that Paul was its author. Inquiries into date and authorship, and the discovery that some old traditions are not trustworthy, should not be thought of as attacks on the inspiration or authority of biblical writings.

A search for truth.

3. Critical investigation into the origin and history of the books of the Old and New Testaments is invaluable for the knowledge it gives us of *what the Bible is.* Some people seem verily to imagine that the Holy Scriptures are as miraculous a gift of God as if they had long ago suddenly fallen out of heaven in one complete copy, with every page and letter written by the immediate finger of God. There can be no intelligent study of these sacred books where such unnatural notions receive encouragement. On the contrary, it may be safely affirmed that in just such proportion as the human standpoint of the biblical writers is vividly apprehended, and the human elements of their compositions are discerned, will the divine contents of these Scriptures be measurably grasped, and

What is the Bible?

impart their sanctifying spirit to the reader's soul. When men come to see that the Bible is as truly human as it is divine much that now appears in biblical controversies will have become obsolete.

4. These critical researches develop new life and zest in the devout study of the "divine library" of Holy Writ. Encouragement to the careful examination of other literatures is also given by inquiries into all that can elsewhere be found touching persons and events referred to in the biblical narratives. Philology, archæology, history, and natural science may thus contribute to our better understanding of the Scriptures. If such researches modify and change some of our previous ideas, so that we come to clearer and more correct opinions touching ancient times and persons, we are so far making real progress in the truth. No students of the Bible are more enthusiastic in their work than those who open their eyes to a faithful examination of all the claims of scientific criticism. If one becomes convinced after diligent examination that the results which some critics have reached are not proven, he has by his own personal research received new inspiration and a keener interest in all such biblical study. Enthusiastic searching of the scriptures ought not to be left to specialists.

Criticism inspires enthusiasm.

5. The critical study of the prophetical books exposes the error, too prevalent among the people, that the Hebrew prophets were mainly foretellers of future events. We have seen in the preceding pages that the prophets of Israel and

Nature of prophecy.

Judah were rather great reformers. Their messages are mainly words of admonition, rebuke, warning, expostulation, and consolation. They were inspired voices, speaking in demonstration of the power of the Spirit to the people of their own times. They foretold the penal woes that would come on Israel because of disobedience, and they also predicted the fall of great heathen cities and kingdoms, like Tyre, and Egypt, and Assyria, and Babylon. But the great value of their oracles, whether they referred to things past, present, or future, is seen in the moral and religious lessons they contain. "The prophecies of the Old Testament," says Dr. A. F. Kirkpatrick, "like the epistles of the New Testament, had what may be called a circumstantial origin. Each prophecy, as a rule, bears the stamp of its own age; it is shaped to meet the special needs of those to whom it was first addressed; it bears the impress of the character and the training of the individual through whom it was given. . . . Christian students have learned to take a larger view of the prophet's work. The prophet was not merely, I might even say he was not chiefly, a predictor. He was not so much a foreteller as a forthteller. Insight not less than foresight was the gift of the seer. . . . The prophet's work concerned the past, the present, and the future. The prophets were the historians of Israel. They regarded the history of the nation from a religious standpoint. They traced the direct control of Jehovah over the fortunes of his people, in mercy and in judgment. It was their function to record and interpret the lessons of the

past for the warning and encouragement of the present and the future." [1]

Missionary outfit.

6. In this great missionary age, when the propagators of Christianity are confronting the defenders of other religions, the advocate of the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures needs to be very sure of the grounds he takes. In the conflict of opinions it is worse than idle to put forth extravagant claims for the Bible in the face of religionists who make similar claims for their own sacred books. Learned Brahmans have declared that "the Veda is coeternal with the universe." But the Christian who smiles at such pretensions, as at the delusions of a mystic philosophy, should beware lest he fall unwittingly into the same condemnation. Assertions or claims which cannot be conclusively proven by valid evidence may damage the cause of truth far more than years of faithful teaching can repair. No part of the outfit of a well-trained missionary would seem more important than profound and accurate knowledge of the scientific criticism of the Scriptures.

Disturbs no fundamental doctrine.

7. Finally, let it be observed that the findings of reverent biblical criticism disturb no fundamental doctrine of the Christian religion. The showing that many laws of the Pentateuch are of later origin than the time of Moses, and that the Book of Isaiah is a compilation, takes not "one jot or one tittle" from the truths of God as embodied in

[1] *The Doctrine of the Prophets,* Warburtonian Lectures for 1886-1890, pp. 13, 14. London, 1892.

those books. We have the same Bible, the same divine revelation, the same Christ, even if we do perceive that mistaken notions have long prevailed touching the origin and history of many of the books of the Old and New Testaments. Sound and thorough criticism can never overthrow a truth that is worth preserving, but its tendency is ever to correct mistakes, to seek immovable foundations, to prove all things and hold fast that which is good.

APPENDIX.

ANSWERS OF REPRESENTATIVE EDUCATORS TO THE QUESTION:—

DO THE REFERENCES TO THE OLD TESTAMENT BOOKS, OR THE MANNER OF CITATION FROM THEM, OR ANY STATEMENTS CONCERNING THEM MADE BY CHRIST AND HIS APOSTLES, AS RECORDED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, COMMIT EITHER OUR LORD HIMSELF OR ANY OF HIS APOSTLES TO AN AUTHORITATIVE JUDGMENT ON THE QUESTION OF THE AUTHORSHIP OR THE HISTORICAL CHARACTER OF THE WRITINGS SO MENTIONED?

It is due both to the distinguished educators who furnish the following symposium and to the readers of this volume to insert here a brief introductory note. In my work on *Biblical Hermeneutics* (page 395) I express the following opinion on the subject discussed in this appendix: "There appears no sufficient reason for maintaining that the references to an Old Testament book by the name of its commonly supposed author commits the apostles, the evangelists, or Christ himself to an authoritative judgment concerning the authenticity and genuineness of the book. Such an inference is unnecessary unless it appears that the purpose of the reference was to express a judgment on that subject. . . . The mere allusion to a well-known book, or the mention of its supposed author according to the current opinions of the time, is obviously neither an affirmation nor a denial of the correctness of the common opinion." I am not aware that this statement of the case has been called in question; but, in view of the fact that some writers and speakers have seemed to assume that Christ's language in John v, 46, 47, does virtually settle the question of the

Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, I have thought it highly proper to invite the written judgment of a number of divines, whose position as teachers in the Methodist Episcopal Church and presidents of as many different institutions of learning among us entitles their deliberate expression of opinion in this matter to peculiar weight. With but one exception the views of all these men were unknown to me at the time I requested their contributions to this symposium. I had not expected so remarkable a uniformity of opinion. I also wrote to other distinguished educators occupying like positions in the Church, but none of them were disposed to give public utterance to a contrary opinion, though one or two declined to commit themselves publicly to any opinion on the subject. In adding this interesting and valuable symposium to my little volume I am bound in all fairness to say, and it should go without saying, that what these eminent teachers in the Church have written for this appendix does not in the slightest degree commit them to any of the views set forth in the body of this volume. Each of these writers is responsible only for what appears under his own name. The symposium will at least show the presumption of those who insist that Jesus Christ has by his own declarations foreclosed critical inquiry into such questions as are discussed in the foregoing pages.

REV. J. W. BASHFORD, D.D.,

President of the Ohio Wesleyan University.

I think that the next step of progress which Methodists must take in the criticism and use of the Bible is to apprehend clearly the distinction between Christ's teaching that the Old Testament contains a revelation from God, and Christ's failure to express a judgment as to the authorship, dates, etc., of the books of the Old Testament. The crucial question arising between Christ and the Jews was the question as to whether or not Jesus came from God and was the promised

Saviour and Messiah of the Old Testament. In the discussion of this question Jesus always assumes that the Old Testament contains a revelation from God. In his controversies with the scribes and Pharisees he maintained throughout that the Old Testament bore witness to himself as one sent from God. Luke tells us that, in his most intimate communion with his disciples, "beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself" (Luke xxiv, 27). Again, Christ explains to the disciples "that all things must needs be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses, and the Prophets, and the Psalms, concerning me. Then opened he their mind that they might understand the scriptures; and he said unto them, Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day," etc. Christ thus, in his most intimate and final communication with his disciples, assures them that the Old Testament bears witness to himself, and that the Father, who had spoken to them through the prophets and later through his Son, would guide them also in the discharge of their providential task. If, therefore, certain higher critics reach the conclusion that the Old Testament contains no revelation from God, we should quote against them the repeated teachings and the whole attitude of Christ toward that book, and insist that their view could not be maintained without convicting Christ of either ignorance or misrepresentation in regard to the Old Testament.

Upon the other hand, the questions which now agi-

tate the higher critics in regard to the date and the authorship of certain books of the Old Testament apparently were not present in the thought of Christ or of the Jews. The phrase "Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms," used by Christ, was a common designation of the Old Testament. But certainly it would be unfair to press these words of Jesus as proof that he taught or believed that all of the Old Testament not included in the Psalms and the Prophets was written by Moses. To press Christ's use of this ordinary designation of the Old Testament into a proof that he meant to affirm the Mosaic authorship of certain writings now in dispute is to apply to the interpretation of the New Testament the same literal and Pharisaic spirit which Christ himself condemned in its application to the Old Testament.

Besides, the use of the New Testament references to other writings as an authoritative proof of their genuineness and inspiration proves too much. We all recognize that in verses 14 and 15 the Epistle of Jude quotes from the apocryphal Book of Enoch. Shall we therefore use Jude in theological proof of the genuineness and inspiration of this apocryphal book? Shall we not say rather that Jude's use of this book, like Paul's quotation of a Greek hymn, is not a proof either of the inspiration or of the authorship of the book referred to? But we cannot treat Jude and Paul in this broad, sensible, and spiritual manner and then insist upon the literal and technical interpretation of the phrases used by Christ.

Again, such literal exegesis reminds one of the earlier controversy between scientists and certain theologians. The latter quoted in proof of the geocentric system of astronomy the words of Christ found in Matt. v, 45: "He maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good." The theologians contended that this passage settled the question in favor of the view that the sun rises rather than that the earth revolves upon its axis. They thought that Christ had taken special pains to make a specific declaration that God caused the sun to rise every day. As a matter of fact, however, Jesus in the quotation referred to was not giving the slightest thought to the question of the geocentric or heliocentric problem. He was simply teaching us the great doctrine of forgiveness and of love for our enemies, and in describing God's activity in nature used language common to his times and familiar to all his hearers. I think we should be as untrue to the spirit of Jesus and to the spiritual teachings of the New Testament to press his use of the phrase "Moses, Psalms, and Prophets," as a proof that some controverted passage in Leviticus was written by Moses, as were our fathers in using Christ's words to prove that the earth was the center of the universe and that the sun moved around it. I write this opinion all the more freely because I hold personally, on what seems to me to be good critical grounds, that God gave to us part of the revelation found in the Old Testament through his servant Moses.

J. W. BASHFORD,
Delaware, O.

REV. H. A. GOBIN, D.D.,
President of De Pauw University.

Do New Testament citations from the Old Testament commit the writers or speakers to an authoritative verdict touching questions of authorship, or determine anything as to questions of criticism?

It is fair to assume that such citations are correct, and that they are an evidence, and a strong evidence, on all questions of authorship of the books cited; but I do not think such citations are necessarily conclusive. While they are a strong proof, they are not indubitable. In the history of all speech and literature instances occur where a popular opinion is referred to for purposes of instruction and illustration without passing any judgment upon the correctness of said opinion. In the plain and matter-of-fact discourse of the Anglo-Saxon this concession often occurs. We need not, then, be surprised that in ancient and oriental speech this usage should be more extensive. I am sure it would not be wise to consider the reference to Old Testament incidents and persons as being legendary or mythical, such as allusions to heroes and their wonderful deeds in mythology. As already stated, I would accept every such allusion as in the realm of historical reality; but where an overwhelming proof, tested and confirmed by mature scholarship, should be presented of inaccuracy of reference to authorship, I would accept such proof without any fear that in so doing a reflection would be cast upon the integrity and trustworthiness of the Scriptures.

H. A. GOBIN,
Greencastle, Ind.

REV. CHARLES J. LITTLE, LL.D.,

President of Garrett Biblical Institute.

There are, according to Boehl, thirty-two citations from the Old Testament assigned to Jesus in the Gospels. These could be printed on one page of an Oxford Bible requiring six hundred and seventy-nine pages from Genesis to Malachi. Seven of the citations are from Deuteronomy, four from Exodus, and eight from the Psalter. Of the thirty-nine books, thirteen only furnish citations. References are made, however, to Abel, Noah, Abraham, Lot's wife, Moses, Elijah, Naaman, Solomon, Jonah, and others. The evangelists differ in the form of their citations. Thus Mark does, and Matthew does not, ascribe the fifth commandment to Moses. Both, however, speak of it, and the connected passage, Exod. xxi, 17, as the commandment of God. Exod. iii, 6, is quoted from the "Book of Moses." Exod. xxi, 24, guardedly thus: "Ye have heard that it was said." Psa. cx is attributed to David. Other psalms are quoted as scripture simply, except Psa. lxxxii, 6, of which Jesus says, "Is it not written in *your law?*" Isa. liv, 13, is cited as "written in the prophets." Twice only is Isaiah cited by name in the synoptics. Isa. lxi, 1, is referred to as read by Jesus from the roll of the prophet Isaiah. Jesus himself speaks of it as "this scripture." Moses is referred to as the "lawgiver," as the author of particular commands, also as the author of certain well-known writings—the latter, though, only in the Fourth Gospel. Passages are dealt with quite freely. They vary both from the Hebrew

and the Septuagint, and are woven together to suit the purpose of the speaker.

In brief, these citations display neither a remarkable knowledge of the Old Testament nor a remarkable reverence for the letter of it. Nevertheless, the hyperbole of the last chapter of the Fourth Gospel should make us wary. We have no complete biography of Jesus; no complete record of his teachings. The Gospels are selected incidents and discourses. He may have cited much more than they have reproduced. He probably "opened up the scriptures" often. But the following suggestions seem to me important:

1. Jesus, according to the record, never cited passages deemed fundamental by many theologians; for example, the story of the fall.

2. Jesus attributed to Moses much of the law ascribed to Jehovah in the Old Testament.

3. He overrules Moses in the Sermon on the Mount with "I say unto you;" in the matter of divorce, attributing the concession to "the hardness of their hearts;" in the matter of the Sabbath, by the sweeping declaration, "The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath." He denied in brief the ethical perfection of the law, and the paramount authority of Moses.

4. If we are to follow John, it is *their* law and *their* scriptures that Jesus insists upon in arguing with the Jews. In a word, he holds them to their own avowals, without committing himself to their opinions.

5. The scriptures cited by him nearly always contain

or suggest his own doctrine. One passage, however, is noteworthy as containing a doctrine which Jesus certainly could not accept literally. This is the startling citation in John x, 35: "Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods? If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came (and the scripture cannot be broken)," etc. Now this scripture is not in the law, but in the Psalms (lxxxii, 6), and reads:

> "I said, Ye are gods,
> And all of you sons of the Most High."

Surely Jesus did not mean to ascribe it to Moses, or to adopt it literally. He meant simply that if this was not blasphemy in the psalmist, neither was it blasphemy in himself.

6. Jesus seldom comments upon the history of Israel, and then only to illustrate his teaching. In the famous passage about John the Baptist he subordinates the whole line of Hebrew writers to the new kingdom. And his doctrines nowhere required him to deal with the history or the authorship of the Old Testament Scriptures. Nor was any such question ever laid before him.

7. There is little to show that Jesus knew the Old Testament thoroughly, or that he was thoroughly acquainted with any one book. Nevertheless, the effect of the narratives is peculiar; the passages cited seem to be, as Jesus himself said, those upon which all the others hang. A close inspection of the words ascribed to Jesus weakens rather than strengthens the contemporary impression as to the authorship of the books

cited. There is nothing to show that Jesus ever attributed Genesis to Moses; indeed, the form of citation leans to the other view. But Abraham, Lot, Moses, Jonah are used by him as though they were the names of historical beings.

8. Jesus was not a teacher of history. If he had been he might have superseded current historical impressions, just as he superseded current morality. But as a teacher "he humbled himself" to very narrow limits. He spoke also in parables, in order that he might *not be understood too rapidly.* If a teacher must stop to correct every error incorporated in human language his task becomes impossible. An allusion to Jonah no more determines the literary character of that book than an allusion to Bunyan's pilgrim. The most that can be said is that Jesus never declared these characters unhistorical, which is very far from declaring them historical.

9. This raises the theological question: Did Jesus know the whole case, and knowing it did he refrain from correcting misconceptions?

Let us consider for a moment the ethics of pedagogy. Is a teacher, even an omniscient one, bound (or even justified) to correct the *connotation* of terms which he uses to *denote* well-known objects? Will he not mislead and bewilder his disciple, if he abandons his principal propositions for collateral inquiries and corrections? Consider this also: If Jesus was bound to correct errors as to the Old Testament Scriptures was he not bound to correct all the errors that he touched?

For example, he said, "Not that which goeth into a man defileth him; it goeth out into the draught." This is not true: it may and often does poison the blood. Impure water causes typhoid fever. Why did not Jesus correct this false and dangerous physiology?

10. But is a voluntary limitation of omniscience any more than a voluntary limitation of omnipotence? Was not a voluntary ignorance a necessary part of his humiliation? Was omniscience the moral condition of the human mind of Jesus? In short, was his omniscience actual or potential?

Why did not Jesus abolish slavery? Was he not omnipotent? Why did he not heal all diseases of humanity? Did he not know how? Why did he not establish better government? Had he not the wisdom and the power?

The essence of the incarnation is voluntary limitation: limitation of power and of knowledge. Legions of thoughts were at his command; he summoned them only as they were needed. "He was found in fashion as a man." Potentially he knew everything, the binomial theorem, the microbes in polluted water, the authorship of Genesis and of the psalms. To say that he knew them actually is to deny to him the possibility of voluntary ignorance. Omnipotence did not exclude hunger, pain, sorrow of soul; why should omniscience continually load down with infinite weight his human brain? As strength was needed, it was there; when knowledge was required, it came. And his not correcting error is no more an argument against his om-

niscience than his voluntary submission to the wickedness that nailed him to the cross is an argument against his omnipotence.

11. Finally, this argument to forestall conclusions and to push inquiry into the structure of the Old Testament by an appeal to Jesus tends to shatter his moral and spiritual authority. The expanded argument runs thus: *The assertions of Jesus are true. That Moses wrote the Pentateuch is an assertion of Jesus. Therefore, that Moses wrote the Pentateuch is true.* The minor premise is unwarranted, as we have shown. But we shall soon see it in a new combination, namely: *Whoever asserts that Moses wrote the Pentateuch asserts a falsehood. Jesus asserted this. Therefore Jesus asserted a falsehood.* Eager combatants carry in their desperation the ark itself into the controversy; they learn nothing from the past. The mystery of the incarnation involves so much that we should be slow to drag it into controversies which may be settled without such violent expedients. I, for one, refuse to join the dangerous adventure.

C. J. LITTLE,
Evanston, Ill.

REV. SAMUEL PLANTZ, D.D.,
President of Lawrence University.

The problem before us is whether the statements of certain New Testament passages are decisive concerning the critical questions of Old Testament books. These passages are of two kinds: first, those of certain New Testament writers like Jude, and second, those

which are given as the utterances of Jesus Christ. The first class of passages need not detain us; for only such a literal theory of inspiration as cannot be rationally held can attach more importance to them than that they express opinions current in the day when they were written. The utterances of Christ, however, cannot be so easily dismissed; for, being the God-man, his affirmations are naturally regarded as a declaration of final authority upon all matters on which he speaks. To many it seems entirely inconsistent with his character as one who came to bear witness to the truth, that he should make implications or affirmations which modern scholarship should disprove.

Now, that Christ seems to assume the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch in several passages, found in each of the four Gospels, cannot be doubted. He says, "Moses said, Honor thy father and mother." He distinguishes between the teachings of Moses and the traditions of the elders, calling the former the very "word of God." Of the Jews he asks, "Did not Moses give you the law?" implying that he did. And finally we find him saying to certain listeners, "Had ye believed Moses ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me." Now, the question is, does Christ in these passages mean to speak with critical exactness, or is he only using customary forms of designating certain parts of the Old Testament Scriptures?

Those who take the former view argue that the natural interpretation and implication of Christ's words is that he means to teach that Moses is the author of

the Pentateuch. He expressly says Moses gave the law, and "wrote of me." The question of the authorship of biblical books, it is affirmed, involves their worth, and thus bears practically and vitally on the interests of religion itself; and where such issues are involved we should expect Christ to speak with care and authority. Morever, it is asked how far this principle of accommodation to current misconceptions is to go, how far we are authorized to discount the statements of Christ on the ground that he is adopting language and views current among the Jews of his day. If we can do so concerning what he says about the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, why may we not regarding what he says about future punishment, the existence of the devil, and the resurrection of the dead?

These positions doubtless have a certain weight, but to my mind they are not conclusive. And first, for the reason that in no case where Christ refers to Moses do the circumstances warrant us to think that he is pronouncing a literary judgment. He is not considering questions of criticism, but only using Moses's name to designate certain portions of Scripture. His purpose in each case seems to be not scientific, but practical and spiritual. He is confronting current Jewish ideas with the authoritative declaration of the word of God. It is not at all to his mind to pronounce on the authorship of the Pentateuch, but only to show that certain opinions are not in harmony with certain Scriptures which have come to be known as the teachings of Moses.

Second, it seems to me very doubtful whether

Christ's knowledge extended to exact scientific and historical detail. What limitations a human brain, as the organ of mental action, had on Christ's spirit we do not know. To what depths the *kenosis* extended is not clearly indicated. However, we are plainly told that Christ "grew in wisdom," and it is certain that he came only gradually even into the consciousness of his Messianic mission. He tells us that his knowledge is limited concerning the day and the hour of his second coming. In none of his discourses does he make statements or allusions to scientific and historical ideas not current in his time. He seemed to have a perfect insight into ethical and spiritual principles, to see intuitively into the depths of moral and religious truth, but he does not show that he knew the world's literature, or science, or history, except as it was known by the Jews of Palestine in his day. Paul manifests literary culture, and it is probable that if Christ had known all the facts of history and science it would have been indicated somewhat in his discourses. I regard it as doubtful, therefore, whether he knew the historical process of the composition of the biblical writings.

Third, Christ's general attitude to the Old Testament needs to be considered. He does not have a rabbi's view of these scriptures, esteeming them on the basis of tradition, but regards them because of the religious truth they embody. Their worth consists not in the personalities of their authors, but in the word of God which he believes they express. Instead of indiscriminate reference, he treats these scriptures as a critic.

Some books he never quotes. In others he distinguishes the "weightier matters of the law" from that which he regards as of minor importance. Some things in the law he sets aside as imperfect and transitory. He tests all freely, and decides upon its value solely on the basis of ethical and spiritual significance. Such being his attitude and point of view, the authorship, Mosaic or otherwise, would not be considered as important by Christ, and we could scarcely expect from him a statement contradictory of current opinion.

Fourth, as the question of authorship was not in Christ's time a matter in dispute, it would have been useless for him to have called up that question, contradicted current traditions, aroused opposition, and thus hindered the progress of his work. While Christ did not hesitate to oppose the opinions of his day when it was necessary, this does not appear to be a case of that kind, and would probably have done more harm than good. Christ did not undertake the task of setting the world right on all its erroneous opinions. He does not deem it necessary to stop to explain the true position of the earth in the solar system, but refers to the sun as rising and setting. He evidently regarded it well for men to be left to solve some questions for themselves.

Finally, I may say I do not think it is any implication against the authority of Christ as a religious teacher that he accommodated himself in some of his references to current Jewish misconceptions. Accommodation of this kind is customary and innocent. Indeed,

it is often necessary. One must keep to the main matter in mind, and cannot turn aside to explain every possible implication. It would be utterly impossible to explain the crude morality of the Old Testament and believe in the inspired life of that people, except on this principle. Instead of accommodation showing imperfection, it may manifest the highest wisdom and the greatest pedagogical insight.

Our conclusion, then, is that the aim of Christ in his teachings was a purely religious one; that in no case did he intend to pronounce critical opinions on the structure and growth of the Old Testament books; that he assumes the premises of his hearers when he quotes from Moses as the author of the Pentateuch; that he finds the value of Scripture not in authorship but in the truth declared; that no one can tell what he would have said if a question of criticism had been submitted to him; and, therefore, that higher criticism is not and cannot be disposed of in advance by an appeal to the authority of Christ. We do not believe it would have been for our good to have had historical and scientific investigation forestalled in any such peremptory way. It is not the method of God's providence, nor is it in harmony with the ordinary tenor of Christ's teaching; for instead of anticipating the questions of scholarly research he always leaves us to solve them for ourselves.

SAMUEL PLANTZ,
Appleton, Wis.

REV. BRADFORD P. RAYMOND, D.D.,

President of the Wesleyan University.

As seen from the philosophical side, it is evident that there must have been such a limitation of knowledge on Christ's part as put him essentially under the conditions of ordinary men; otherwise much that he said and did would become a caricature, if not a fraud. How, if omniscient, could he pray, "If it be possible, let this cup pass from me"? How could temptation be real if from the beginning the details of its genesis, its development, and its issue all stood obtrusively out before him? The teaching of the first chapter of Hebrews is very suggestive on this point. He is able to succor the tempted because he himself "hath suffered being tempted." This was made possible because he was made in all things like unto his brethren, and thus conformity is explained in that he took not on him the nature of angels, but the seed of Abraham. Here is logical order and necessity. Here we find ourselves in the deeps of the kenotic theory, which cannot here be discussed. It is clear, however, that the divine consciousness, if carried over into the details of human life, would deny some things which are specifically stated in the New Testament, would render much that is written meaningless, and would make the teaching that the child Jesus "grew and waxed strong in spirit" purely magical. Once upon this ground of magic, all the apocryphal stories of his youth would be in place.

Philosophy teaches that self-limitation does not

destroy God. Set up nature, or laws of reason, as independent entities, and let them presume to lord it over the Deity, and he is compromised. But there is no philosophical objection to the hypothesis, and no compromise of the dignity of Christ's nature in the hypothesis, that he lived voluntarily under the limitations of man; omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience might all be set aside if essential to the accomplishment of the divine purpose.

The sanity of Jesus's teaching is to be found in the fact that the concrete material which he handled was always treated in its relations to the kingdom. This kingdom was actual in him, its principles were alive in him, its goal was open to him. The leaven in the meal was used to set forth the method of growth; it is not necessary, however, to suppose that he knew aught of the chemistry of fermentation. That would be as wild as to suppose that he had before his consciousness the apparatus of the chemical laboratory of to-day by which the processes of fermentation are studied. This illustrates his general use of nature and natural phenomena.

In like manner Jesus accepted the traditional view of the Old Testament scriptures. It was not necessary for him to raise either the question of fact in detail, or the question of authorship, or the question of documents, or of structure of book or books. The kingdom of God had already been realized in him. Its genesis, its guarantee, its goal, and its principles were unrolled like a map before his consciousness. The kingdom of

heaven as he knew it was not a matter of marital relations dependent upon sex and issuing in family life; it is a matter of love, joy, and peace in a spiritual life. God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. The traditional view is basis enough for these lessons. He accepted that view and raised no critical question. This illustration may be applied to all the concrete cases from the Old Testament scriptures with which he had occasion to deal. This theory, while it does not deny the uniqueness of Christ's character and teaching, proceeds upon the hypothesis that he wrought under actual human conditions, always remembering that there was no taint of sin upon him, and that he learned carpentering as did other boys, the law and the prophets by study and instruction as did others, and that as he submitted himself to the conditions of baptism for the fulfillment of all righteousness, just so had he wished to learn chemistry or biology he would have submitted himself to such helps as were available at that time. Was he exempt in the matter of historic knowledge? To affirm that he had knowledge of the critical questions which agitate Christian scholars to-day is to deny that he was made like unto his brethren: it is to compromise the reality of his humanity and to start on the road that leads to docetism. Fairbairn's conclusions are just: "The humanity of the Saviour must be absolutely real."

B. P. RAYMOND,
Middletown, Conn.

REV. WILLIAM F. WARREN, D.D.,

President of Boston University.

The arguments of those who answer this question in the affirmative are built up in precisely the same way as those of Gaussen and similar writers in support of the verbal inspiration of every word and syllable of holy scripture, and they produce upon my mind precisely the same effect. If I accepted the former I should feel bound to accept the latter. My real view I have sufficiently indicated on pp. 378-379 of the *Methodist Review* for May-June, 1899.[1] In close connection therewith I pointed out a curious law, or uniform tendency discoverable in religious authorship, a law most interesting in itself and of great importance in current biblical discussions on questions of authorship.

WILLIAM F. WARREN,
Boston, Mass.

---

[1] For the convenience of readers who have not ready access to the number of the *Methodist Review* referred to, it is proper to state that Dr. Warren illustrates this "curious law in religious authorship" by the various "existing recensions and versions of Coke and Asbury's letter commending the book of Discipline to the laity of the Church." He observes that, "Like every page of the book to which they are prefixed, they remind us that in sacred texts authorship is as likely to be corporate and cooperative as it is to be individual and autographic. They illustrate the fact that holy writings may be ascribed to holy men who never wrote a line of them, and yet without the slightest thought of fraud, pious or impious." Further on he adds: "Conservative in his sympathies, the writer has always been anxious to make the most of Christ's apparent testimony to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. At the

same time, he has not been able to conceal from himself the precariousness of the argument. Because Jesus spoke of Moses as having 'given' the Jews their law, we have been told that Moses wrote the first five books of the Bible and in the exact form in which we have them to-day. It is a large conclusion to draw from such a premise. Many an historian of Methodism has in like manner, and truthfully, said that John Wesley 'gave' to our Church its Articles of Religion; but it is equally true that not one line of them was written by John Wesley. It is perfectly proper to say that the founder of Methodism wrote the 'General Rules of our United Societies;' yet when we turn to them in our Discipline we find some things therein which Wesley never wrote. In nearly all modern hymnals poetic or unpoetic redactors present over the authors' names famous hymns in forms to which those authors would have raised strenuous objection, and this is often done without the slightest warning to the innocent reader."

INDEX.

Addis, 26.
Allegorical parables, 147.
Amos, 82.
Andrews, Bishop, on higher criticism, 5.
Arndt, 106.
Asbury, 195.

Ballantine, 100, 107.
Barak, 61, 93.
Bashford, J. W., on New Test. citations, 176.
Bethel, 85.
Blumenbach, 143.
Burgess, 45.

Canon, necessity of, 35.
Canon of Prophets, 51.
Canonizing books, 13–16.
Carpenter, 26.
Cheyne, 99, 132.
Citations in New Test., 113, 144, 145, 175.
Clarke, 4, 69.
Codes of Mosaic Law, 28.
Coke, 195.
Conditionality of prophecy, 149.
Confucius and Moses, 22.
Cornill, 89.
Covenant, book of, 30.

Daniel, book of, 152.
David, 64.
Davidson, A. B., 56.
Decalogue, 28, 29.
Delitzsch, 115, 116.
Deuteronomic Code, 32, 33.
Deuteronomy, author of, 24.
Duodecalogue, 31.

Ecclesiasticus, prologue, 15.
Elijah and Elisha, 68.
Elijah, prayer-test of, 74–76.
Embellishment of narrative, 54, 70.
Episcopal address of 1900, 5.
Ewald, 57, 94, 112, 140.
Exodus, author of, 24.
Ezekiel, 102.
Ezra the scribe, 12, 13.

Fairbairn, 194.
Firdausi, 55.
Fowler, Bishop, on higher criticism, 6.

Gaussen, 195.
Genesis, an epic, 37.
Genesis, author of, 23.
Gideon, 60.
Gobin, H. A., on New Test. citations, 180.
Grotius, 101.

Habakkuk, 91.
Hagiographa, 12, 81.
Hammond, 128.
Harford-Battersby, 26.
Harman, 4.
Hebrew literature lost, 36.
Hexateuch, 55.
Hilkiah, discovers Law, 13, 32, 97.
Holiness, Law of, 33.
Hosea, 89.
Hurst, Bishop, on higher criticism, 6.

Inspired fiction, 138, 154.
Isaiah, 90.
Isaiah, book of, 114.

JANNES and Jambres, 145.
Jephthah, 61.
Jeremiah, 89.
Jerome, 11.
Jonah, book of, 139.
Joel, 112.
Josephus, 54.
Joshua, 59.
Joshua, book of, 54.
Judges, book of, 55, 56.

KENOTIC theory, 185, 187, 192.
Kings, book of, 58.
Kirkpatrick, 172.
Kleinert, 146.

LAW and Psalms, 17.
Law of Holiness, 33.
Laws, classification of, 39–44.
Levitical Code, 33, 34.
Leviticus, author of, 24.
Library, the divine, 11.
Little, C. J., on New Test. citations, 181.

MACCABEAN psalms, 15.
Malachi, 132, 133.
Mallalieu, Bishop, on higher criticism, 6.
McCabe, Bishop, on higher criticism, 6.
Mede, 128.
Merrill, Bishop, on higher criticism, 6.
Messianic prophecy, 160, 161.
Micah, 90.
Moses, greatness of, 21.
Moses, writings of, 23.

NAHUM, 91.
Nation, founding of, 37.
Nehemiah, library of, 15.
Ninde, Bishop, on higher criticism, 6.
Numbers, author of, 24.

OBADIAH, 112.

PENTATEUCH, composite, 25–28.
Plantz, S., on New Test. citations, 186.
Porphyry, 158.
Prayer-test of Elijah, 74–76.
Prophecies unwritten, 81.
Prophecy, nature of, 125.
Prophets, schools of, 67.
Prophets, sons of, 68.
Protestantism, principle of, 3, 7.
Psalms, vindictive, 98.
Pusey, 142.

RAYMOND, B. P., on New Test. citations, 192.

SAMSON, 61.
Samuel as prophet, 67.
Samuel, book of, 57.
Saul, 63.
Sayce, 27.
Schrader, 156.
Sinaitic Code, 30–32.
Sirach, son of, 15.
Smith, W. R., 90.
Solomon, 65, 66.
Stanley, 56, 57, 62, 63, 95, 99, 158.
Symposium on higher criticism, 5–7.
Symposium on New Test. citations, 175–196.

TALMUD, 53.
Tekoa, 83, 85.
Tradition, value of, 111.

VINCENT, Bishop, on higher criticism, 7.

WARREN, W. F., on New Test. citations, 195.
Wesley, 195.
Wright, 147.

ZECHARIAH, book of, 126.
Zephaniah, 91.

WORKS OF
MILTON S. TERRY, D.D., LL.D.

EATON & MAINS, Publishers,
New York, Boston, Pittsburg, Detroit, San Francisco.

JENNINGS & PYE,
Cincinnati, Chicago, Kansas City.

Biblical Hermeneutics. A Treatise upon the Interpretation of the Old and New Testaments. 8vo, . . $3 00

Biblical Apocalyptics. A Study of the Most Notable Revelations of God and of Christ in the Canonical Scriptures. 8vo, ... 3 00

The New Apologetic. Five Lectures on True and False Methods of Meeting Modern Philosophical and Critical Attacks upon the Christian Religion. 12mo, . . 85

Moses and the Prophets. An Essay toward a Fair and Useful Statement of Some of the Positions of Modern Biblical Criticism. 12mo, ... 1 00

The Prophecies of Daniel Expounded. 12mo, . . 75

The Song of Songs. An Inspired Melodrama, Analyzed, Translated, and Explained. Square 16mo. White leatherette, ... 25
White cloth, ... 35

The Sibylline Oracles. Translated from the Greek into English Blank Verse, with Notes. New edition, revised according to the text of Rzach. 12mo, . . . 2 00

Commentary on Genesis and Exodus. (Whedon Series on the Old Testament, Vol. I.) 12mo, . . . 2 00

Commentary on Judges, Ruth, First and Second Samuel. (Whedon Series, Vol. III.) 2 00

Commentary on Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther. (Whedon Series, Vol. IV.) . . . 2 00

Rambles in the Old World. Portrait. 16mo. Gilt top, uncut 1 00

BIBLICAL HERMENEUTICS.

New York Evangelist.

This book is an honor to the Methodist Episcopal Church and to American scholarship. In our judgment it is the best piece of literary work which the Methodist Church in this country has yet produced.

Methodist Review.

One of the most elaborate and able works ever issued from our press. It is written in clear, manly English, and embodies a vast compass of erudition and thought.

The Presbyterian Review.

It is the best treatise on the subject in the English language, and may be cordially recommended to students.

The Independent.

The work is admirably arranged and developed. It is carried out with the thoroughness which is expected of a manual, and as a whole is characterized with excellent good sense and an intelligent comprehension and consideration of all details and topics.

Zion's Herald.

Far the most elaborate and exhaustive work upon the science of Biblical Interpretation that has been written by an American or English author.

The Christian Guardian.

The work is systematic in its plan, comprehensive in its range of topics, and able and scholarly in its treatment of all branches of the subject.

The Christian Intelligencer.

A very complete treatise, written in a simple and lucid style marked with good sense, and containing the results of wide reading and careful study.

The Advance.

Evidently the most elaborate American book on the subject. It translates many passages well, and handles them with unusual skill.

BIBLICAL APOCALYPTICS.

Lutheran Quarterly.

This book is one of more than ordinary value and importance. The reader will in every passage discussed find a meaning, clear, definite, intelligible, and supported by considerations that everyone must respect, even though he may not accept. The work is able, intensely interesting, and will prove helpful to anyone who cares to know what God has spoken in past times.

The Michigan Advocate.

Dr. Terry is a fearless investigator, a sturdy thinker, and does not hesitate to accept the well-attested results of modern scholarship. This volume will stimulate study, and will elevate the interpretation of the Bible to a loftier and more satisfying plane.

The Outlook.

A sane and wholesome exposition of those facts of the Bible which are most liable to be misunderstood. The author follows the historical method of interpretation, which modifies many current notions, while conserving the substance of fundamental truths.

The Epworth Herald.

This noble volume will be welcomed by every lover of Scripture for the help it gives to a proper understanding of the most obscure and most puzzling parts. The Book of Revelation becomes, under the author's treatment, less of a puzzle and more of a revelation.

Northwestern Advocate.

We do not hesitate to rank this as one of the most helpful books on interpretation printed this year. Dr. Terry has not apparently avoided any passage because of its difficulty; he has not apparently left any difficulty without due consideration. His gift of exposition almost amounts to genius.

The Churchman.

Professor Terry has struck the keynote of the modern interpretation of the Bible, which unfolds each portion in accordance with the canons of exegesis that belong to the specific kind of literature with which each is classed. This gives life and color to whole books that without it have baffled the exegetical skill of Christendom.

Bibliotheca Sacra.

Altogether it is one of the most learned, thorough, and helpful discussions in biblical interpretation which have been written in recent times.

THE NEW APOLOGETIC.

Methodist Review.

These five lectures cover a wide range in a comparatively brief survey, compress much information for ordinary readers, illuminate the subjects treated, correct various prevalent misconceptions, and show the solidity of the foundations of the Christian faith.

The Expositor (London).

This volume may be recommended to the multitude whose writings in our religious papers show how little they perceive the intellectual attitude. and how unable they are to understand the moral position of men who really influence the thought of our time. A new apologetic that shall save us, by teaching fundamental principles, from stoning our own prophets while building sepulchers to Galileo and hosts of his successors, will render a service to theology second to none.

The Independent.

The value of this little book is in the inverse ratio of its size. . . . No one will ever close it with the feeling, This man has not answered his own doubts, much less can he reply to mine.

Christian Work.

An exceedingly able book, popular, yet learned, advanced, but evangelical.

Central Advocate.

The volume is clear, coherent, stimulating, judicial in tone, and thoroughly modern in spirit, while in scholarly qualities it leaves nothing to be desired. It will diffuse some needed information, and will help biblical students to master facts and principles in regard to the Word of God which will be of service to them in apprehending its scope and meaning.

Epworth Herald.

These lectures should be read by every minister and every student of theology. There is, perhaps, no other work of the same compass in which the temper of our times is so candidly and so comprehensively reviewed, or the weaknesses of skepticism so thoroughly exhibited.

W7-DJF-800